AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SOURCES RELATING TO THE GERMANIC INVASIONS

BY

CARLTON HUNTLEY HAYES, A. M.

Lecturer in History in Columbia University

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

1909

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SOURCES RELATING TO THE GERMANIC INVASIONS

BY

CARLTON HUNTLEY HAYES, A. M.

Lecturer in History in Columbia University

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



1909

Copyright, 1909

by

CARLTON HUNTLEY HAYES

PREFACE

THE following pages are an outgrowth of a course on the dissolution of the Roman Empire which the author pursued at Columbia University during the academic year 1905-1906 under the direction of Professor James Harvey Robinson. The study centered chiefly about what was evidently the most fateful factor in the process of the disruption of the empire,—the entrance of the Germans; and it occurred to the writer that the story of barbarian immigration might be conveniently culled from the sources, done into English, and presented frankly with full confession of the obscurity, the frequent contradictions, and the fragmentary character of the narratives, and without imaginative reconstructions or interpretations. But after two years' study of the long list of sources, it became apparent that the complete fruition of such an undertaking would be the result only of a labor of many years. Accordingly it has been thought expedient at this time to publish a review of precisely what are the most important sources relating to the Germans from Cæsar's "Commentaries" and Plutarch's "Life of Marius" down to Paul the Deacon's "History of the Lombards," together with extracts, translated into English, illustrative of their general character and relative merit.

"Germanic Invasions" has been selected as a convenient term to designate all the movements by which Germans and other northern peoples came within the borders of the Roman commonwealth: it includes peaceful immigration, whether individual or tribal, marauding expeditions, settlements fixed by treaty, armed invasions, even entrance as

soldiers or slaves of the empire,—in a word, every manner by which a barbarian of the north came into immediate contact with Roman institutions and Roman civilization. Thus it embraces the armed invasion and attempted settlement of northern tribes over a hundred years before Christ and all the subsequent Germanic movements down through the fifth and sixth centuries, which witnessed migrations of entire peoples, repeated sacks of Rome, and the establishment of practically independent "kingdoms" on the soil of the empire. The principal sources for the eighth century, when the barbarians were extensively and permanently settled in their new homes, provide a suitable stopping-point for the review, although the expeditions of the Northmen, Slavs, and Hungarians in the tenth and eleventh centuries might almost be reckoned among the "Germanic Invasions."

The sources under review are exclusively Latin or Greek. The early Germans themselves left no records, not a book, not an inscription, not a monument. The epic poems, the sagas and the songs, of Scandinavia and Germany, were mediaeval, not ancient. Their old traditions and customs were recorded solely by natives of the Mediterranean region, foreigners to them. And, as Fustel de Coulanges has said, What should we know of the Egyptians if we derived everything from Greek sources?

Then too, the sources for the period are mainly narrative. The documentary sources, which should accompany and check personal impressions, are difficult to understand and in the past have been a subject of special investigation by lawyers rather than by historians: it is hardly possible in a summary of this kind to give them the prominence they deserve. Further, the limits of the present work have excluded altogether the scant monumental sources relating to the Germanic invasions.

The apology for this slender review, which the writer presents with considerable diffidence, is its uniqueness. Histories of classical literature treat usually of but a small part of the field here covered, and their comments on the historical are almost invariably choked by their appreciations of the purely literary. On the other hand, the great guides to the general sources of the middle age—Potthast, Molinier, Wattenbach, Ebert, Gross—hardly go back of the reign of Theodosius the Great. If the present work prove in any way useful or suggestive as a brief outline of our chief sources of information about the Germanic Invasions, and an *introduction* to a more careful and painstaking study on specific points, it will have accomplished every desired end.

The author is under obligations in one way or another to those mentioned in the footnotes or in the final bibliography, and he has made use of the indicated translations while often assuming the liberty to amend them. To Professor James Harvey Robinson of Columbia University, the writer owes the greatest debt: Professor Robinson has been his guide throughout his graduate work as well as the father and designer of this work and has repeatedly suggested many helpful ideas, the poor expression of which is the writer's. To Professor James Thomson Shotwell of Columbia University, who also has given valuable and helpful counsel and has sacrificed many hours to the tiresome task of reading copy and proof, the author is under special obligations.

C. H. H.

Columbia University, New York, May, 1909.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION 13

CHAPTER II

PLUTARCH 19

CHAPTER III

CÆSAR 30

CHAPTER IV

HISTORIANS AND GEOGRAPHERS OF THE EARLY PRINCIPATE.

Velleius Paterculus 36
Florus 39
Appian 40
Suetonius 40
Strabo 41
Pliny 44
Pomponius Mela 44

CHAPTER V

TACITUS 46

CHAPTER VI

NARRATIVE SOURCES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES.

Dio Cassius 54
Herodian 56
Augustan Historians 56
Eutropius 59
Aurelius Victor 59
Ammianus Marcellinus 60

PAGE

CHAPTER VII

Relations of the Germans to the Empire from Julius Cæsar to Theodosius the Great 64

CHAPTER VIII

General Character of the Germanic Invasions 82

CHAPTER IX

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian.
Zosimus 88
Greek Fragments 98

CHAPTER X

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): The Ecclesiastical Historians.
Augustine 104
Orosius 106
Eusebius and his Continuators 118
Sulpicius Severus 120

CHAPTER XI

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): Other Christian Writers.
Jerome 121
Salvian 124
Victor Vitensis 127
Saints' Lives 127

CHAPTER XII

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): Poets and Panegyrists 134

CHAPTER XIII

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): The Chroniclers 145

CHAPTER XIV

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued):
Cassiodorus 155
Jordanes 158
Procopius 168

PAGE

CHAPTER XV

SOURCES FROM JUSTINIAN TO PIPPIN.
Gildas 178
Gregory the Great 182
Gregory of Tours 184
Venantius Fortunatus 189
Isidore of Seville 191
Venerable Bede 192
Pseudo-Fredegarius 192
Gesta regum Francorum 194
Paul the Deacon 195

CHAPTER XVI

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES.
Roman and Barbarian Codes 199
Ecclesiastical Legislation 218

BIBLIOGRAPHY 224

INDEX OF SOURCES 227

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Who the Germans were and whence they came no one knows. One theory, advanced and supported by eminent scholars and writers of the nineteenth century, was based largely on the comparative study of languages resulting from the discovery of Sanscrit. This presupposed the existence in primitive times of a distinct white or Aryan race, which migrated in great troops from its original home in the valley of Mesopotamia or in the Hindu Kush through Asia into Europe. These various troops brought with them a common patrimony of language and civil and religious institutions, though variously developed by reason of different local conditions; and they entered Europe at various successive times: the Italo-Greeks, the Celts, the Germans, and finally the Slavs. It was generally held that the Aryans invaded Europe from east to west, and then from north to south, subjugating the primitive and savage peoples with whom they came in contact. Each invading troop sought to displace the preceding one, and it was thus that in historic times the Germans fought and at last overcame the people of the Roman empire.

Present-day anthropologists, however, tend to modify, if not to destroy, this theory of an Aryan race: they make clear that *race*, as used to denote peculiar variations of physical characters — especially head-form, color and stature, — is quite independent of language or nationality. The same language may be spoken and the same general customs followed by peoples of different physical characteristics and

by different nations. A language and certain customs, developed by a given population in a definite region, may spread beyond their original area among neighboring populations, or they may shrink until they are used by a mere fragment of the people that gave them birth. The boundaries of a nation or the political organization of a tribe may be changed by a single battle, irrespective of the languages spoken or the social customs prevailing or the races represented in the affected region.

With these facts in mind, the anthropologists have set out to study the physical characteristics of peoples, but the statistics gathered so far are at best relatively scanty and admit of wide differences of interpretation as to the classification and origin of races. A few scholars still adhere to the Asiatic origin of Europe's dominant peoples, but many others now affirm that the northern, or Teutonic, peoples as well as most of those of the Mediterranean region emigrated originally from Africa,[1] while still others trace racial differ-

[1] William Z. Ripley (*The Races of Europe*, New York, 1899) concludes that there are three race-types in Europe. The first has a long head, long face, dark-brown or black hair, dark eyes, a rather broad nose, and a slender frame of medium stature. The second has a broad or round head, a broad face, light-chestnut hair, hazel-gray eyes, a variable nose—though rather broad and heavy—a stocky build and medium stature. The third has a long head, a long face, light hair, blue eyes, a narrow aquiline nose, and tall stature. Mr. Ripley designates these types as Mediterranean, Alpine and Teutonic respectively, his Alpine type being the Celtic of many other writers. He states his opinion regarding the origin of the three race-types that the long-headed brunette Mediterranean is an African type, showing some approach to the negro; that the Teutonic is an offshoot from the Mediterranean, locally developed amid peculiar physiographic surroundings; and that the broad-headed Alpine type is Asiatic and has moved in like a wedge between the two European populations before the dawn of recorded history. Mr. Ripley finds nowhere absolute purity of race; almost everywhere two, or all three, of the fundamental races come into contact and influence one another. See also G. Sergi, *The Medi-*

ences almost entirely to environment or lapse into skepticism about the whole matter.

It is sufficient for our purposes to point out that there is no conclusive proof as to the exact origin of the Germans. In prehistoric times they may have been black men living under the cocoanut trees of central Africa or they may have had yellow skins and tended flocks on the slopes of the Himalayas, or perhaps, as Tacitus intimates with an ignorance as colossal as our own, they may simply have sprung from the soil in northern Europe, blue-eyed and yellow-haired. Nor have we conclusive proof that the "Germanic" invasions of historic times were effected by a homogeneous people of Tacitean type; on the contrary, there is evidence to show that there were notable differences among the invaders.

These differences did not appeal to the ancient writers as much as on first thought we might anticipate. Very few writers visited the Germans in their own settlements. And we should not expect the Romans to make any clean-cut racial distinction between themselves and the Germans when we remember what "Roman" meant. The Roman commonwealth grew gradually and fortuitously from a city-state on the Tiber into an empire completely encircling the Mediterranean, and including in itself a vast number of peoples profoundly differing from each other in language and characteristics. The word "Roman" followed the territorial and political expansion of the commonwealth, until, in accordance with the famous edict of Caracalla in

terranean Race (London, 1901). J. Deniker, *Races of Man* (London, 1900), distinguishes ten race-types in Europe. Ripley states in a criticism of Deniker's work: "The eye has been blurred by the vision of anthropometric divergences, so that it has failed to notice similarities." Ripley has been similarly criticized by Professor F. Boas for refusing to recognize a *single* white race, of which there are branches due to local environmental conditions.

A. D. 212, a Roman citizen might be a Briton at York or a Spaniard at New Carthage or a Greek at Corinth or a Syrian at Damascus. Everyone within the community of law was a "Roman;" everyone outside was a "barbarian." Thus "barbarian" meant simply a foreigner, an alien, and was applied alike to Parthian, German, Nubian and Hun. Citizenship, not language or custom or race, was the supreme test with the Roman; and the babel of peoples which composed the Roman commonwealth was not concerned with nice distinctions between foreign tribes.

The ancient writers, in fact, hardly had the anthropological idea of race at all, for their gradual discrimination between barbarians was founded chiefly on differences of language or customs. Pytheas of Marseilles had recognized a people distinct from the Celts whom he called Scythians, but it was much later before we hear about German characteristics. The names *Germani* and *Germania* do not seem to have been appellations applied by any people to themselves; and it is probable that the Romans borrowed the words from Gallic peoples to designate at first specific tribes across the Rhine and later all the vague and varied populations who lived beyond the northern frontier. Tacitus wrote about a hundred years after Christ:

> The name "Germania," they say, is modern and of recent application, since those who first crossed the Rhine and expelled the Gauls, and who are now called "Tungri," were then named "Germani;" thus what had been a tribal name, not a national name, spread little by little, so that later they all adopted the newly-coined appellation that was first employed by the conquerors to inspire fear and called themselves "Germani".[1]

[1] *Germania*, 2. Wachter and Grimm suggest that the root in "Germani" is identical with that in the old Irish battle-cry, *gairm*.

That the names *Deutsch* and Teuton, as generic designations, do not belong to antiquity, is generally conceded;[1] the latter was used by Roman writers to designate only a specific tribe of northern invaders, and the former is not met with until the ninth century after Christ. Most modern scholars agree, however, that the two words were derived from a common root, *thiod*, meaning "people," which appears in Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, and other comparatively early German languages.

The earliest historical source of information about these peoples is the few extant fragments of Pytheas of Marseilles. His native city had been established about six hundred years before Christ as a Greek colony and had early taken much of the northern trade out of the hands of the rival Phoenicians and Etruscans. Marseilles may or may not have had intercourse in that early period with peoples north of the Rhine. Pytheas himself was an astronomer and a traveler who resided at Marseilles, probably about the time of Alexander the Great or shortly afterwards, and wrote accounts of his travels in Greek. The original is lost but a few fragments are preserved, chiefly in the geography of Strabo,[2] in the natural history of the Elder Pliny,[3] and in the dry lexicographical work of Stephanus

[1] G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte,* 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1880), vol. i, p. 11; F. Dahn, *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker* (Berlin, 1881), vol. i, p. 18. The Old High German adjective, *diutisk*—"pertaining to the people,"—which was written *theodiscus* in the Latin of the ninth century, became the *diutsch* or *tiutsch* of Middle High German, and the *deutsch* of Modern German.

[2] Strabo was a contemporary of Augustus (see *infra,* p. 41). He distrusted Pytheas, even going so far as to dub him a liar (*ἀνὴρ ψευδέστατος*). The moderns, however, have usually taken Pytheas quite seriously. See R. Pallmann, *Die Cimbern und Teutonen, ein Beitrag zur altdeutschen Geschichte und zur deutschen Alterthumskunde* (Berlin, 1870).

[3] Died 79 A. D. See *infra,* p. 44.

of Byzantium.[1] From what we have,[2] we judge that Pytheas took two voyages, one to Britain and to a land six days' sail from thence which he calls Thule, where the day and the night were each six months long, and another along the coast of Europe from Gadira[3] to the Tanais river.[4] His references to the peoples whom he saw are so scanty as to be practically negligible.

[1] Stephanus lived after the time of Arcadius and before that of Justinian II. The best edition of his extant writings is by A. Meineke (Berlin, 1849). See J. Geffcken, *De Stephano Byzantio* (Göttingen, 1886). A few other quotations from Pytheas are to be found in the fragments of Eratosthenes (276-196 B. C.), a member of the Alexandrian school, who acquired fame as an astronomer and is credited with having been one of the first to produce a systematic treatise on geography. For the fragments of the writings of Eratosthenes see H. Berger, *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes* (Leipzig, 1880).

[2] The extant fragments of Pytheas's work, Περὶ Ὠχεανοῦ, have been collected and edited by Schmekel, *Pytheae Massiliensis quae supersunt fragmenta* (Merseburg, 1848).

[3] Cadiz.

[4] Some contend that this is the Don; others favor the Elbe. But whether Pytheas described the Mediterranean coast or that of the Atlantic matters little to us; his description is lost.

CHAPTER II

Plutarch

It is commonly alleged that the Cimbri and Teutones, who appeared in Gaul in 114 B. C., plundered that country and Spain likewise, who defeated in turn five Roman armies sent against them, and were at length annihilated by Marius in 101 B. C., were the first Germans to come into conflict with Rome.[1] If we rely exclusively on the sources,[2] however, we cannot be certain that they were Germans. Most of our information on the matter is contained in the biography of Marius by Plutarch, who wrote approximately two hundred years after the events he narrates.

Plutarch was born at the town of Chaeronea in Boeotia probably between A. D. 45 and 50. He studied at Athens and at Alexandria, and for a time lectured at Rome on philosophy and rhetoric. He taught the future emperor Hadrian and was admitted to consular rank by Trajan. In his old age he was appointed procurator of Greece, and died about A. D. 120 in his native town where he had long been an archon and a priest of the Pythian Apollo. Plutarch wrote his charming and justly-famed parallel biographies of distinguished Greeks and Latins[3] for edification rather

[1] *Cf.* G. Bloch, *La Gaule indépendante et la Gaule romaine* in E. Lavisse, ed. *Histoire de France,* vol. i (Paris, 1900).

[2] The sources on the Cimbri and Teutones are in general fragmentary and scattered through various writers. Johann Müller, *Bellum Cimbricum* (Schaffhausen, 1772) brought together two hundred and fourteen references of the ancients to the Cimbri, and twenty others were added in a revision (1805).

[3] Probably begun at Rome during the reign of Trajan, and com-

than for historical truth; his main object was to present distinct character sketches. It has been conceded that he showed little critical insight in the use of his authorities and that his work abounds in manifold inaccuracies and mistakes, yet in the absence of other material we are tempted to accept the moralizings of this Greek rhetorician as authentic, if not inspired, historical data.

Plutarch spoke and wrote in Greek, and lamented a limited knowledge of Latin, which may account for some of the inaccuracies in the *Lives*. He mentions incidentally that he had seen the bust or statue of Marius at Ravenna, but that is all we know about his travel in Italy, and there is no mention whatsoever of his having been in Gaul. In one way or another, however, he used several earlier works [1] in writing the biography of Marius. It has been suggested that his unfavorable criticisms of the old general were quite possibly taken from Sulla's memoirs [2] and the apology of Catulus,[3] both of which are now unfortunately lost. On the general conditions of the times, Plutarch had Sallust,[4]

pleted and published late in life at Chaeronea. The best text of the Βίοι Παράλληλοι is that of C. Sintenis in the Teubner series, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1875-84). There is an English translation in the Bohn Classical Library by A. Stewart and G. Long, 4 vols. (London, 1900). See R. C. Trench, *A Popular Introduction to Plutarch* (London, 1873).

[1] See H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1897).

[2] Lucius Sulla (138-78 B. C.), the aristocratic dictator and life-long rival of Marius, wrote a history of his own life and times in twenty-two books, which he called the *Memorabilia*. See A. H. Beesly, *The Gracchi, Marius and Sulla* (New York, 1892).

[3] Catulus was proconsul and joint commander with Marius in the battle against the Cimbri.

[4] Sallust (86-34 B. C.) wrote an account of the expedition of Marius against Jugurtha, and from fragments we gather that he wrote five books on the civil wars between Marius and Sulla, the introduction to which may have dealt with the Gallic campaign of Marius. Judging

Livy [1] and Posidonius. The last named was the most important. A celebrated astronomer and Stoic philosopher at Rhodes, an instructor of Pompey and of Cicero, he continued the history of Polybius from the point where that work broke off (146 B. C.) down to his own times. Although his history is lost, we know that Posidonius [2] not only had, as an envoy from Rhodes, interviewed Marius but had also been in Gaul and knew the Celts.

Thus a Greek moralist who knew Latin imperfectly and had probably never traveled in Gaul, prepared an edifying character sketch of a Roman general who incidentally had fought some peoples in Gaul two centuries previously, rely-

from what we know of Sallust as an historian, we cannot believe that if he did write about the troubles in Gaul, his observations would have been precise or profound. The fragments are edited by B. Maurenbrecher, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1891-3). There is a good English translation by Pollard (1882).

[1] Livy (59 B. C.-17 A. D.), who undertook to write not a critical history but a lively narrative to rekindle a patriotic spirit among his countrymen, may best be regarded as a remarkable story-teller with excellent diction but with slight attention to fact. Practically the whole history after 167 B. C. is lost. There is a translation into Elizabethan English by Philemon Holland (London, 1600), and of books xxi-xxv into modern English by Church & Brodribb (2nd ed., London, 1890).

[2] Strabo and Appian likewise used Posidonius. Important fragments of the work are preserved by Athenaeus (170-230 A. D.), a Greek scholar of Alexandria and Rome, in a curious miscellany called Δειπνοσοφισταί or *The Banquet of the Learned*, edited by G. Kaibel in the Teubner series (Leipzig, 1887). There is a literal English translation by C. D. Yonge in the Bohn Classical Library, 3 vols. (London, 1854). The extant fragments of Posidonius were collected and edited by Bake (Leyden, 1810). Posidonius was used by Justin, a Latin historian who is generally supposed to have flourished in the age of the Antonines and who epitomized the general history of Trogus Pompeius; Justin is edited by J. Jeep in the Teubner texts (Leipzig, 1886) and translated into English by J. S. Watson in the Bohn Classical Library (London, 1876).

ing for the truth of his adventitious remarks on works the most of which,—the reminiscences of our general's political and military rivals, the histories of a Roman politician, and of a Roman story-teller, and last but not least the statements of a man of Rhodes who had actually had a look at Gaul,—are now lost and are consequently beyond our power to verify. These adventitious remarks on the Gallic campaign of Marius comprise almost all we know about the Cimbri and Teutones! This is what Plutarch says of them:[1]

. . . It happened that the Romans had just received intelligence of the capture of Jugurtha when the reports about the Cimbri and Teutones surprised them, and though the rumors as to the numbers and strength of the invaders were at first disbelieved, it afterwards appeared that they fell short of the truth. Three hundred thousand armed fighting men were advancing, bringing with them a much larger number of women and children, in quest of land to support so mighty a multitude and of cities to dwell in, after the example of the Celtae before them,[2] who took the best part of Italy from the Tyrrheni and kept it.

As these invaders had no intercourse with other nations, and had traversed an extensive tract of country, it could not be ascertained who they were or where they issued from to descend upon Gaul and Italy like a cloud. The most probable conjecture was that they were Germanic nations belonging to those who extended as far as the northern ocean; and this opinion was founded on their great stature, their blue eyes, and on the fact that the Germans designate robbers by the name of Cimbri.

[1] English translation by A. Stewart & G. Long in the Bohn Classical Library (London, 1900).

[2] The invasion of northern Italy by the Celtae is mentioned by Livy (Bk. v, ch. 34) and referred by him to the reign of Tarquinius Priscus.

Others thought that Celtica extended in a wide and extensive tract from the external sea and the subarctic regions to the rising sun and the Lake Maeotis [1] where it bordered on Pontic Scythia; and it was from this region, as they supposed, where the tribes are mingled, that these invaders came, and that they did not advance in one expedition nor yet uninterruptedly, but that every spring they moved forwards, fighting their way, till in the course of time they traversed the whole continent. Accordingly while the barbarians had several names according to their respective tribes, they designated the whole body by the name of Celtoscythians.

But others say that the Cimmerians, with whom the ancient Greeks were first acquainted, were no portion of the whole nation, but merely a tribe or faction that was driven out by the Scythians and passed into Asia from the Lake Maeotis, under the command of Lygdamis: they further say that the chief part of the Scythian nation and the most warlike part lived at the very verge of the continent, on the coast of the external sea, in a tract shaded, woody, and totally sunless, owing to the extent and closeness of the forests, which reach into the interior as far as the Hercynii; and with respect to the heavens, their position was in that region where the pole, having a great elevation owing to the inclination of the parallels, appears to be only a short distance from the spectator's zenith, and the days and nights are of equal length and share the year between them, which furnished Homer with the occasion for his story of Ulysses visiting the ghosts.[2] From these parts then some supposed that these barbarians came against Italy, who were originally Cimmerii, but then not inappropriately called Cimbri. But all this is rather founded on conjecture than on sure historical evidence.[3]

The importance of identifying the Cimbri and Teutones

[1] Sea of Azov.

[2] Odyssey, bk. xi, v. 14 *et seq.*

[3] Ch. 11.

with the Germans was not so clear to the Romans as to certain modern German scholars. Plutarch himself was not a man of conviction in the matter. These peoples might be Germans—they had great stature and blue eyes! But again they might be Celts, for Celtica could extend, so far as the Greek philosopher was concerned, from Gaul throughout northern Europe and well into Asia "where the tribes are mingled." And peradventure, they were neither Germans nor Celts, but a lost tribe of the Cimmerians, the ancient enemies of the Hellenes.

It is doubtful whether the very words "Cimbri" and "Teutones"[1] are German; they may be merely Gallic. Various Greek authors, whom Diodorus of Sicily[2] quotes without naming them, thought the Cimbri were Cimmerians, the people at that time living north of the Black Sea, whose name has been preserved in the Crimea. Cicero in 55 B. C. thought the Cimbri were Gauls.[3] This identifica-

[1] The word "Teutones," as we have already seen, may have been derived from some popular Germanic appellation such as *thiod*, meaning "people." If so, it may be reasoned that this particular tribe spoke a Germanic language and came perhaps from far-away Scandinavia; but, on the other hand, it may also be reasoned that a Gallic tribe was designated by a colloquialism borrowed from their neighbors across the Rhine which Roman writers heard of and used. The Roman name of the tribe would hardly be in itself convincing proof of the tribe's origin. The tribe might be Teutonic or it might be Gallic.

[2] A contemporary of Julius Caesar and of Augustus, who published a general history in thirty books from earliest times to the end of Caesar's Gallic war. The extant fragments are edited by L. Dindorf, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-8).

[3] "Even that great man, Caius Marius, whose amazing divine valor came to the assistance of the Roman people in many of its distresses and disasters, was content to check the enormous multitudes of Gauls who were forcing their way into Italy, without endeavoring himself to penetrate into their cities and homes."—*Oration on the Consular Provinces*, ch. 13.

tion of the Cimbri with the Cimmerians and likewise with the Gauls produced a curious result in the Jewish Antiquities of Josephus,[1] a work completed as late as 93 A. D., after Caesar and others had popularized the distinction between Gauls and Germans. Josephus says that Japhet, son of Noah, had seven sons, one of whom was Gomares, the progenitor of the Gomareis whom the Greeks called Galates and who were otherwise variously known as Gauls and as Cimmerians.[2] In view of these facts, we shall do well to accept as inspired the illuminating remark with which Plutarch concludes his three theories of the origin of the invaders, "all this is rather founded on conjecture than on sure historical evidence."

Plutarch has little to say of the institutions and customs of the Cimbri and Teutones which can help us in a study of the Germanic invasions. The military events absorb his interest, although his accounts of the barbarian movements are most confusing. The invaders do not appear to have been very different from many others with whom the Romans fought:

As to their numbers, they are stated by many authorities as above rather than below what has been mentioned. But their courage and daring made them irresistible, and in battle they rushed forward with the rapidity and violence of fire, so that no nations could stand their attack, but all the people that came in their way became their prey and booty, and many powerful Roman armies with their commanders, which were

[1] Bk. i, ch. 6. The works of Josephus have been edited by B. Niese, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1885-95) and translated into English by W. Whiston.

[2] The theory of Josephus received the strong condemnation of Jerome, *In Ezechielem.* It seems, however, that no statement of an ancient is too preposterous for a modern to believe. Amédée Thierry in his *Histoire des Gaulois* (10th ed., Paris, 1881) has approved the supposition of Josephus!

stationed to protect Gaul north of the Alps, perished ingloriously;[1] and indeed these armies by their unsuccessful resistance mainly contributed to direct the course of the enemy against Rome. For when they had defeated those who opposed them and got an abundance of booty, they determined not to settle themselves permanently anywhere till they had destroyed Rome and ravaged Italy.[2]

. . . [Marius led an army into Gaul against the Teutones, who] made their appearance in numbers countless, hideous in aspect, and in language and the cries they uttered unlike any other people.[3] . . . The daily sight of them not only took away somewhat of the first alarm, but the threats of the barbarians and their intolerable arrogance roused the courage of the Roman soldiers and inflamed their passions, for the enemy plundered and devastated all the country around[4] . . . [In battle] though full of food and excited with wine, they did not advance in disorderly or frantic haste, nor utter confused shouts, but striking their arms to a certain measure, and advancing all in regular line, they often called out their name, Ambrones,[5] either to encourage one another or to terrify the Romans by this announcement[6] . . .

In the pursuit [of the Teutones after the first battle], the

[1] Cn. Papirius Carbo, one of the consuls for the year 113 B. C., was defeated by the Cimbri and Teutones in Illyricum; in 109 B. C. the consul M. Junius Silanus was defeated by the Cimbri, who in vain demanded settlements of the Roman senate; in 107 B. C., while Marius was fighting Jugurtha, the consul L. Cassius Longinus was killed in battle with the Gallic Tigurini and his army surrendered; two years later the consul Cn. Manlius Maximus and the proconsul Q. Servilius Caepio were defeated by the Cimbri with great loss.

[2] Ch. 11. [3] Ch. 15. [4] Ch. 16.

[5] Plutarch mentions Ligurians in the army of Marius who were called Ambrones. The Ligurians were not Germans, and if these Ambrones among the barbarians were of the same people as the Ligurian Ambrones with Marius, then it is certain that at least a part of the invaders were non-Germans.

[6] Ch. 19.

Romans took prisoners and killed to the number of about 100,000; they also took their tents, wagons and property, all which, with the exception of what was pilfered, was given to Marius, by the unanimous voice of the soldiers. . . . Some authorities do not agree with the statement as to the gift of the spoil, nor yet about the number of the slain.[1] However, they say that the people of Marseilles made fences round their vineyards with the bones, and that the soil, after the bodies had rotted and the winter rains had fallen, was so fertilized and saturated with the putrified matter which sank down into it, that it produced a most unusual crop in the next season, and so confirmed the opinion of Archilochus [2] that the land is fattened by human bodies.[3] . . . [Marius held the kings of the Teutones] in chains, for they were taken in the Alps in their flight by the Sequani.[4] . . .

[Meanwhile, the Cimbri crossed the Alps and] attacked and took the fort on the farther side of the Adige, though the Roman soldiers defended it with the utmost bravery and in a manner worthy of their country. Admiring their courage, the barbarians let them go on conditions which were sworn to upon the brazen bull, which was taken after the battle, and, it is said, was conveyed to the house of Catulus as the first spoils of the victory.[5] . . . They sent to Marius to demand land for themselves and their brethren, and a sufficient number of cities for their abode. On Marius asking the ambassadors of the Cimbri whom they meant by their brethren, and being told they were the Teutones, all the Romans who were present burst out into a laugh, but Marius, with a sneer, replied, "Don't trouble yourselves about your brethren: they have land, and they shall have it forever, for we have given it to them." [6] . . .

[1] Velleius Paterculus (ii, 12) makes the number of barbarians who fell in the two battles over 150,000.

[2] A Greek lyric poet who lived in the seventh century B. C.

[3] Ch. 21. [4] Ch. 24. [5] Ch. 23. [6] Ch. 24.

[The Cimbri then prepared to join battle with the combined armies of Marius and Catulus.] Their infantry marched slowly from their fortified posts in a square, each side of which was thirty *stadia;* the cavalry, 15,000 in number, advanced in splendid style, wearing helmets which resembled in form the open mouths of frightful beasts and strange shaped heads surmounted by lofty crests of feathers, which made them appear taller; they had also breastplates of iron and glittering white shields. Their practice was to discharge two darts, and then closing with the enemy, to use their large heavy swords.[1] . . . It happened that the barbarians closed with Catulus, and the struggle was with him and his soldiers chiefly, among whom Sulla says that he himself fought: he adds that the heat aided the Romans, and the sun, which shone full in the face of the Cimbri. For the barbarians were well inured to cold, having been brought up in forests, as already observed, and a cool country, but they were unnerved with the heat, which made them sweat violently and breathe hard, and put their shields before their faces, for the battle took place after the summer solstice, and, according to the Roman reckoning, three days before the new moon of the month now called August but then Sextilis.[2] . . . Now the greater part of the enemy and their best soldiers were cut to pieces in their ranks, for in order to prevent the line from being broken the soldiers of the first rank were fastened together by long chains which were passed through their belts. The fugitives were driven back to their encampments, when a most tragic scene was exhibited. The women standing on the wagons clothed in black massacred the fugitives, some their husbands, and others their brothers and fathers, and then strangling their infants they threw them under the wheels and the feet of the beasts of burden, and killed themselves. . . . But though so many perished in this manner, above 60,000 were taken prisoners, and the number of those who fell was said to be twice as many . . .[3]

[1] Ch. 25. [2] Ch. 26. [3] Ch. 27.

This is most of what we know about the Cimbri and Teutones. The fate of the survivors is neglected; Plutarch must decide the dispute as to whether Marius or Catulus deserved the credit for the victory. He was not writing an account of barbarian invasions; he was preparing an edifying biography of Marius.

CHAPTER III

Caesar

No evidence has come down to us that prior to the opening of the first century before Christ the Romans had any clear ideas about the Germans or about the peoples in Gaul.[1] It was, in fact, at least fifty years after the appearance of the Cimbri and Teutones, before any source distinguished Germans from Gauls.

The man who did the most in all probability to vulgarize this distinction was Julius Caesar, who, as political and military head of Gaul for several years, knew the country and the people at first hand, saw Germans and heard something about their customs, and about 51 B. C. committed to writing an account of his experiences and observations.[2] As Cicero says:

Caesar thought it his duty not only to war against those men whom he saw already in arms against the Roman people but to reduce the whole of Gaul under our dominion. He accordingly fought with the greatest success against most valiant and powerful tribes, Germans and Helvetians; and

[1] See J. Cramer, *Die Verfassungsgeschichte der Germanen und Kelten* (Berlin, 1906), and M. H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Les Celtes depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 100 avant notre ère* (Paris, 1904).

[2] *Seven Books of Commentaries on the Gallic War.* The edition in the Teubner series is by B. Dinter (Leipzig, 1890). There is an English translation, needlessly involved in style, by W. A. McDevitte in the Bohn Classical Library. See T. R. Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (London, 1899).

other tribes he alarmed and drove back and defeated and accustomed to acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman people; so that those districts and those tribes which were previously unknown to us by anyone's letters or through a personal account of anyone, or even by vague report, have now been traversed by our own general, by our own army, and by the arms of the Roman people.[1]

Caesar was certainly in a position to know a good deal about Gaul and he has been generally credited with insight into Celtic institutions and customs.[2] He, moreover, distinguished them from the Germanic:

. . . It does not appear to be foreign to our subject to lay before the reader an account of the customs of Gaul and of Germany, and wherein these tribes differ from each other. [In Gaul there is bitter factional feeling; the mass of the people are serfs and have no part in politics; the privileged classes are the Druid priests and the free knights; the Celts are especially superstitious, though they have a rather well-developed legal system].[3] The customs of the Germans differ much from the Gauls, for neither have they Druids to preside over religious services nor do they care much for sacrifices. They count among the number of the gods those alone whom they behold, and by whose instrumentality they are obviously benefited: namely, the Sun, Vulcan, and the Moon; of the other deities they have never even heard. Their whole life is occupied in hunting and in military pursuits; from childhood they devote themselves to hardships and fatigue. Those who have remained chaste for the longest time, receive the greatest commendation among their people. . . . They do not pay much attention to agriculture, and a large part of their

[1] Cicero, *Oration on the Consular Provinces,* ch. 13, delivered 55 B. C.

[2] See C. Julian, *Histoire de la Gaule,* vol. ii, *La Gaule indépendante* (Paris, 1908).

[3] Summary of chapters 11-20 of bk. vi.

food consists of milk, cheese and flesh; nor does anyone possess a fixed piece of land as his own property, with fixed boundaries, but the magistrates and chiefs assign every year to the tribes and families, who have assembled together, as much land as they please in any locality they see fit, and on the following year compel them to move elsewhere. . . . It is the greatest glory to the several tribes to lay waste the borders of their territory as great a distance as possible and make them uninhabitable. . . . Both in defensive and in offensive war, leaders are chosen and given even power of life and death. In peace there is no common ruler, but the chiefs of the districts and cantons administer justice and settle controversies among their own people. Robbery committed beyond the boundaries of a tribe bears no infamy, and they avow that it is committed for the purpose of disciplining their youth and of preventing sloth. And when any of their chiefs has said in an assembly that he will be their leader in a foray, let those who are willing to follow him present themselves; they who approve of both the raid and the man arise and promise their assistance, and are applauded by the masses; such of them as do not then follow him are considered deserters and traitors, and thereafter no faith whatever is placed in them. To injure guests they hold to be a crime; they defend from wrong those who have come to them for any reason whatever, and esteem them inviolable; to them the houses of all are open and they are furnished with food.

And there was formerly a time when the Gauls excelled the Germans in prowess, and waged war on them offensively, and, on account of the great number of their people and the insufficiency of their land, sent colonies over the Rhine . . .[1]

Such are the salient points in Caesar's account of the Germans. They have been taken very seriously by many scholars and have supplied the first foundation for the construction of monumental works on the economic and political institutions of the Teutonic peoples.

[1] vi, 21-24.

The question immediately arises, how did Caesar know the Germans? We learn that he had some Germans in his own army: he would be likely to hear something about other Germans from them. We know too that he had many Germans in arms against him, for various bands were hired by this or that faction of the Gauls to fight him, and his troubles were not minimized by Ariovistus or by the Suevi. As commander-in-chief of the Roman forces, Caesar felt the necessity of studying and knowing the opposing forces, these troublesome tribesmen whose chronic instability was a menace to the commonwealth. He talked with their envoys and questioned the Celts about them. He twice crossed the Rhine, but the longer trip lasted but eighteen days, and his first-hand knowledge of the Germans in their own home must have been very limited. It may be said, in fact, that Caesar learned almost everything he knew about the Germans not in their country but in his own territory, and then too, chiefly from their enemies. Practically everything he had to accept on hearsay:

Ambassadors who came from the Aedui *said* in complaint that the Harudes, who had lately been brought over into Gaul, were ravaging their territories, and that they were unable to buy peace from Ariovistus even through hostages; and from the Treviri, that a hundred cantons of the Suevi had encamped on the banks of the Rhine and were attempting to cross it.[1]

The tribe of the Suevi is by far the largest and the most warlike tribe of all the Germans. They *are said* to possess a hundred cantons, from each of which they yearly send from their territories for the purpose of war a thousand armed men: the others who remain at home maintain both themselves and those engaged in the expedition. The latter again, in their turn, are in arms next year: the former remain at home. Thus neither husbandry nor the art and practice of

[1] i, 37.

war are neglected. But among them there exists no private and separate land; nor are they permitted to remain more than one year in one place for the purpose of residence. They do not live much on corn, but subsist for the most part on milk and flesh and are much given to hunting.[1] . . .

They [the Suevi] esteem it their greatest praise as a tribe that the lands about their territories lie unoccupied to a very great extent inasmuch as it indicates that a great many tribes cannot withstand their power; and thus on one side of the Suevi the lands *are said* to lie desolate for about six hundred miles[2] . . . The Ubii also, who alone, out of all the tribes lying beyond the Rhine, had sent ambassadors to Caesar and formed an alliance and given hostages, earnestly entreated that he would bring them assistance because they were grievously oppressed by the Suevi; or, if he was prevented from doing so by the business of the commonwealth, he would at least transport his army over the Rhine; that that would be sufficient for their present assistance and their hope for the future; that so great was the name and reputation of his army, even among the most remote tribes of the Germans, arising from the defeat of Ariovistus and this last battle which was fought, that they might be safe under the fame and friendship of the Roman people. They promised a large number of boats for transporting the army.[3]

[After crossing the Rhine the first time, Caesar] learned from the Ubii these particulars, that the Suevi, after they had found through their scouts that the bridge was being built, had called the usual council and issued general orders to remove the women, children, and property from the towns into the woods and to assemble in one place all who were capable of bearing arms . . .[4]

Caesar undoubtedly made it a point to obtain the most trust-

[1] iv, 1. [2] iv, 3. [3] iv, 16.

[4] iv, 19. Another example is furnished in vi, 10: Caesar is informed by the Ubii concerning the movements of the Suevi, and has the former send spies among the latter to report to him about them.

worthy information, but he got it from Treviri and Ubii, who were being threatened by the Suevi and who would naturally stretch the truth if necessary in securing Roman protection against their northern and eastern enemies. The conditions under which Caesar's authorities gave him information are not conducive to our faith in its objectivity. Nor is it probable from Caesar's own statement that the Treviri and the Ubii themselves knew a great deal about the Suevi. A few merchants passed between them,[1] and armed bands appeared now and then. Caesar writes of the Germans only incidentally and always vaguely: he says nothing of their geography and little of their political organization. Tacitus, who cites him about the Gauls, does not seem to take him seriously about the Germans, and often contradicts him. Whatever may have been the development in Germany in the century and a half which intervened between Caesar and Tacitus, and no matter how little we esteem Tacitus, we must express the conviction that Caesar's Commentaries are neither obviously authoritative nor even fully reliable as a source on the Germans.

In a passage quoted above, Caesar states that the lands on one side of the Suevi "are said to lie desolate for about six hundred miles." That would be as far as from Brussels to Berlin! Caesar also tells[2] about bisons, unicorns and other strange beasts in the Hercynian forest. Those scholars who suspect that Caesar was misinformed on these points should remember that he might have been misinformed on others, and they should not make haste to build political and economic systems on his frankly hearsay testimony.

[1] That merchants were few may be inferred from the account of the Suevi: "Merchants have access to them more because they want to sell what they have taken in war than because they need the importation of any commodity." iv, 2.

[2] vi, 25-28.

CHAPTER IV

Historians and Geographers of the Early Principate

The wars of Augustus and Tiberius against the Germans undoubtedly stimulated the interest of the Romans in the northern barbarians. We know at least of two works on the German wars: Quintilian speaks [1] of the *libri belli Germanici* of a certain Aufidius Bassus, whom scholars have arbitrarily assigned to the time of Tiberius; and the Elder Pliny (23-79 A. D.) wrote a history of the Germanic wars in twenty books. We know nothing of the life of Aufidius Bassus, of his qualifications as an historian, of his accuracy or of his importance.[2] In the case of Pliny we know [3] that he was commander of a troop of cavalry in Germany in the time of Claudius and was high in political favor with Vespasian, being a provincial governor and superintendent of finances in Italy, and we would conclude therefore that Pliny had unusual opportunity for knowing the Germans and that his position in Roman official society would give his statements added authority. But both works are lost and there are few direct allusions to either by later writers.

The general history of Livy might be expected to supply

[1] *Inst. Orator.*, x, 1, 103.

[2] Quotations from Aufidius Bassus are given by Seneca Rhetor, *Suasoriae*, vi, 18, 23; and it has been repeatedly affirmed that his work was used by Dio Cassius and Suetonius.

[3] We are indebted for an account of Pliny's literary labors to his nephew, the Younger Pliny (*Epist.*, iii, 5; vi, 16). That Pliny had seen the Germans in their own homes, we gather from the *Natural History*, xvi, 1, 2.

some interesting if unreliable anecdotes about the Germans, but his books relating to that subject are lost.

Almost our only available contemporary account of the Germanic wars of this early period of the principate is that of Velleius Paterculus (*cca.* 19 B. C.-A. D. 31). Velleius was an army officer, at first in the east under Gaius Caesar, the grandson of Augustus, and afterwards in Germany under Tiberius. For his enthusiastic support of the latter, he was rewarded by receiving several military and political promotions. About A. D. 30, he prepared a succinct compendium of universal history[1] with special reference to Rome, beginning with the settlement of Magna Graecia. Velleius was quite obsessed by the idea of "essentials in history" and selected only those events in the past which had a particular fascination for himself and which he thought had had a paramount influence in shaping the affairs of the commonwealth, so that his book assumed the method and the purpose of the "Beacon Lights of History." The selection is naturally arbitrary, and there are few signs of critical insight. On his own times Velleius becomes more diffuse, but his fulsome praise of Tiberius has detracted from his reputation as an impartial historian: he is hardly more than a partisan memoir writer. His own account of his enlistment with Tiberius is suggestive:

That year made me a soldier in the camp of Tiberius Caesar, having previously held the office of tribune. Shortly after-

[1] *Historiae Romanae ad M. Vinicium Consulem Libri Duo,* edited by R. Ellis (Oxford, 1898), translated into English by J. S. Watson in the Bohn Classical Library. The Teubner edition is by C. Halm (Leipzig, 1876). The text is in an especially unsatisfactory condition; the only manuscript which survived the middle ages was lost in the seventeenth century and we are dependent on very imperfect copies. A large collection of the historical blunders of Velleius is given by H. Sauppe, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin, 1896), pp. 39-72. See P. Kaiser, *De fontibus Velleii* (Berlin, 1884).

wards, being sent with him into Germany in the post of commander of cavalry, succeeding my father in that office, I was, for nine successive years, either as prefect, or lieutenant-general, a spectator, and, as far as the mediocrity of my ability allowed, an assistant in his glorious achievements. Nor do I think that any human being can have an opportunity of enjoying another spectacle like that which I enjoyed, when, throughout the most populous part of Italy, and the whole length of the Gallic provinces, the people, on seeing again their former commander, who was a Caesar in merit and power before he was so in name, congratulated themselves even more warmly than they congratulated him. At the very sight of him, tears of joy sprang from the eyes of the soldiers, and there appeared in their salutation an unusual degree of spirit, a kind of exultation, and an eager wish to touch his hand. Nor could they restrain themselves from adding, "General, we welcome you;" or again, "General, I was with you in Armenia," "I in Rhaetia," "I was rewarded by you in Vindelicia," "I in Pannonia," "I in Germany;" all this cannot be described in words, and perhaps will scarcely gain belief.[1]

Velleius is sorely disappointing as a source for the Germans. He neglects the splendid opportunity of recording for us the habits and customs passing daily under his very eyes. In the few pages which he devotes to the subject, he tells only of military operations and personal anecdotes, and everything is subordinated to the one great purpose of praising Tiberius:

I cannot forbear inserting the following incident, whatever may be thought of it, among affairs of so much greater magnitude. While we were encamped on the hither bank of this river [the Elbe], and while the farther bank glittered with the armor of the enemy's troops, who always drew back at the least movement of our ships, one of the barbarians, far advanced in years, of extraordinary stature, and, as his dress

[1] ii, 104.

indicated, of the highest dignity, embarked in a canoe formed of a tree hollowed out, such as is common among those tribes; and, managing this vessel alone, he advanced as far as the middle of the stream, requesting to be allowed, without danger to himself, to land on the bank which we occupied with our army, and to see Caesar. This request was granted. Having then brought his canoe to shore, and contemplated Caesar a long time in silence, he said, "Our young men are certainly mad; they worship your divinity in your absence; yet, in your presence, they choose rather to dread your arms than to trust your faith. For my part, Caesar, I have this day, by your permission and favor, seen the gods, of whom I had before only heard, and I never in my life either wished for or experienced a day of greater happiness." Then, having obtained leave to touch his hand, he re-embarked in his little vessel, and continually looking back at Caesar, sailed away to the bank occupied by his countrymen . . .[1]

Velleius gives hasty sketches of the campaigns in Germany and in Pannonia, but he is not interested in geography, ethnology or race characteristics. He has apparently no settled conviction as to what a German is:

The whole extent of Germany was traversed by our army; nations were conquered that were almost unknown to us even in name. The tribes of the Chauki were reduced to submission. . . . The Langobardi, a nation exceeding even the Germans in fierceness, were crushed . . .[2]

In the absence of other contemporary accounts of the early principate, we are forced to rely on such later historians as Florus, Appian, Suetonius, and Tacitus.[3]

Florus, a native according to some of Spain and to others of Gaul, wrote in the reign of Trajan an abridgment of Roman history[4] from earliest times to Augustus. It was

[1] ii, 107. [2] ii, 106. [3] See *infra*, p. 46 *et seq.*

[4] *Epitome de gestis Romanorum*, or *Bellorum omnium annorum*

based on Livy and other works now lost, and is less a history than a panegyric. Oratorical, affected, obscure, filled with geographical and chronological errors, the epitome enjoyed popularity in the middle ages but is not important for our purposes.

Appian was a Greek historian who lived at Alexandria about the middle of the second century. For a time he was a lawyer at Rome, but later obtained from Antoninus Pius the office of imperial procurator in Egypt. He wrote a work [1] on the development of the Roman empire, extending to the time of Trajan, consisting of a number of special histories of the several periods and the several lands and peoples which fell under Roman control. It originally comprised twenty-four books but only eleven are preserved complete besides the preface. The most important are books thirteen to seventeen on the civil wars. The work is obviously a dry compilation and is disfigured by numerous blunders.

Suetonius, a lawyer at Rome in the reign of Trajan and afterwards private secretary to Hadrian until his familiarity with the emperor's wife drove him from court in disgrace, was in an excellent position to know the scandals and gossip of the time, and his celebrated biographies of the twelve Caesars from Julius to Domitian [2] have conspicuously confirmed his fame as a scandal monger. His history has the

DCC libri duo, usually divided into two books, though sometimes into four. The best edition is that of C. Halm (Leipzig, 1879). There is an English translation by J. S. Watson in the Bohn Classical Library (London, 1898).

[1] The best text is that in the Teubner edition by L. Mendelssohn, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1878-81). There is an English translation by H. White, 2 vols. (New York, 1899).

[2] *Vitae Duodecim Caesarum.* The standard text is that of C. L. Roth (Leipzig, 1886). There is an English translation by Thomson & Forester in the Bohn Classical Library (London, 1881).

form and the relative importance of memoirs; it may be truthful, it certainly is personal and anecdotal. His first care is to picture the personal conduct and habits of the Caesars; only indirectly does he record the military events; the peoples of the empire receive slight attention and the tribes outside the empire even less. The critical reader is impressed with the feeling that Suetonius affords more amusement than information.

Three descriptions of Germany have come down to us from the early period of the principate:[1] the geographies of Strabo and Pomponius Mela, and the natural history of the Elder Pliny.

Strabo, a Greek, was born in Pontus and studied in various eastern cities. He lived some years at Rome, traveled extensively in various countries, and in the reign of Tiberius published in Greek a general geography in seventeen books.[2] The seventh describes that part of Europe north of the Rhine and Danube; roughly speaking, seven pages are given to Germany, three to the Cimbri, fifteen to the Getae, seven to the tribes living at the mouths of the Danube and Dniester, and seven to those in the Crimea. Strabo

[1] In this connection should be mentioned the poetical epistles of Ovid, who was banished by Augustus about A. D. 8 to Tomi (modern Kustindje), a little town on the Black Sea near the mouths of the Danube. There he lived among Getae and Sarmatians and other tribes until his death in A. D. 17 or 18 and composed nine books of letters in verse, which mention the dress and manners, the arms and marauding expeditions, of the barbarian peoples. Ovid's descriptions are colored by his personal grief and by the requirements of his muse. The Teubner text of Ovid is edited by A. Reise (Leipzig, 1871-89).

[2] The best edition is that of A. Meineke, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1866-77). A French translation, undertaken by command of Napoleon (Paris, 1805-19), has valuable notes. There is an English translation by H. C. Hamilton and W. Falconer in the Bohn Classical Library, 3 vols. (London, 1854-57).

did not visit Germany himself and his statements about it are chiefly taken from Caesar and Posidonius.

Strabo had very vague ideas about the German race:

Next after the Celtic tribes come the Germans, who inhabit the country to the east beyond the Rhine; and these differ but little from the Celtic race, except in their being more fierce, of a larger stature, and more ruddy in countenance; but in every other respect, their figure, their customs and manners of life, are such as we have related of the Celts. The Romans, therefore, I think, have very appositely applied to them the name "Germani," as signifying genuine; for in the Latin language *Germani* signifies genuine.[1]

It is apparent that Strabo will not accept every foolish statement of Pytheas or of Posidonius or of Eratosthenes or of anyone else; if he himself does not know the truth of the given statement, he will at least test it by common sense:

Some of the accounts which we receive of the Cimbri are not worthy of credit, while others seem likely enough: for instance, no one could accept the reason given for their wandering life and piracy, that, dwelling on a peninsula, they were driven out of their settlements by a very high tide; for they still to this day possess the country which they had in former times, and have sent as a present to Augustus the caldron held most sacred by them, supplicating his friendship, and an amnesty for past offences; and having obtained their request they have returned home. Indeed, it would have been ridiculous for them to have departed from their country in a pet on account of a natural and constant phenomenon which occurs twice every day. . . . Clitarchus is not to be trusted when he says that their cavalry, on seeing the sea flow in, rode off at full speed, and yet scarcely escaped by flight from being overtaken by the flood; for we know by experience that the tide

[1] vii, 1, 2.

does not come in with such impetuosity, but that the sea advances stealthily by slow degrees . . .[1]

These tribes dwelling along the coast beyond the Elbe are entirely unknown to us; for no one of the ancients with whom I am acquainted has prosecuted this voyage towards the east as far as the mouths of the Caspian Sea, neither have the Romans as yet sailed coastwise beyond the Elbe, nor has anyone traveling on foot penetrated farther into this country. . . . Nor can we say whether these tribes extend as far as the [Northern] Ocean, along the whole distance, or whether [between them and the ocean] there are countries rendered unfit for habitation by the cold or by any other cause; or whether men of a different race are situated between the sea and the most eastern of the Germans . . .[2]

In Strabo we find a distinct trace of that edifying moralizing in contrasting barbarians with Romans which Tacitus was to further, which early Christian writers were to emphasize as a branch of their own apologetics and as an incentive to the growth of a spiritual life, and which finally was to stir modern German patriotism and English pride to the very point of Charles Kingsley's highly idealized parallel between Roman and Teuton. Strabo quotes Aeschylus on the Scythians "governed by good laws and feeding on cheese of mares' milk" and adds:

And this is still the opinion entertained of them by the Greeks; for we esteem them the most sincere, the least deceitful of any people, and much more frugal and self-relying than ourselves. And yet the manner of life customary among us has spread almost everywhere and brought about a change for the worst, effeminacy, luxury and over-great refinement, inducing extortion in ten thousand different ways; and doubtless much of this corruption has penetrated even into the countries of the nomads as well as those of the other barbarians; for having

[1] vii, 2, 1. [2] vii, 2, 4.

once learned to navigate the sea, they have become depraved, committing piracy and murdering strangers; and holding intercourse with many different nations, they have imitated both their extravagance and their dishonest traffic, which may indeed appear to promote civility of manners, but do doubtless corrupt the morals and lead to dissimulation in place of the genuine sincerity we have before noticed.[1]

Pomponius Mela, a native of Spain, wrote about the time of Caligula or Claudius a very concise Latin work on geography,[2] perhaps an epitome of larger works then in existence. It is clear, simple and forceful, but the author gives no sign of having visited Germany himself, and his unquestioning repetition of earlier stories makes his book less important than Strabo's.

Pliny, whose lost history of the Germanic wars is mentioned above, has left a few statements about the Germans in his curious encyclopedic work, the Natural History.[3] He frankly admits that he cannot tell the dimensions of the respective territories of the German tribes, "so immensely do the authorities differ." He distinguishes five races in Germany: the Vandals, including the Burgundians and Goths; the Ingaevones, including the Cimbri, Teutones and Chauki; the Istaevones, including here likewise the troublesome Cimbri; the Hermiones, including the Suevi; and the

[1] vii, 3, 7.

[2] *De situ orbis libri tres.* The best edition is by C. Frick (Leipzig, 1880).

[3] The *Natural History* in thirty-seven books was dedicated to Titus and published in A. D. 77, two years before Pliny lost his life in the eruption of Vesuvius. The introduction states that it was compiled from twenty thousand notices extracted from over two thousand writings. The section on the Germans is in bk. iv, ch. 28. The Teubner edition is by V. Rose (Leipzig, 1875). There in an English translation of the entire work by J. Bostock and H. J. Riley in 6 vols. in the Bohn Classical Library.

Peucini who are also called Bastarnae. It is needless to remark that this distinction is not confirmed by later writers. Pliny makes no effort to describe the customs of the Germans or to go into their history.

The geographers—Strabo, Pomponius Mela, and Pliny—are supplemented by the later work of Ptolemy [1] and the Table of Peutinger,[2] which afford us names of peoples and places and some explanatory notes.

[1] Ptolemy, the famous Greek mathematician, astronomer and geographer, lived at Alexandria in the second century A. D. One of our chief sources for ancient geography is his Γεωγραφικὴ Ὑφήγησις, books ii-vii of which contain names of places in the maps described, arranged according to degrees and their subdivisions. It has been edited by C. Müller (Paris, 1883). The Teubner edition of Ptolemy's works is by J. L. Heiberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1898, 1907).

[2] The Peutinger map, which is now in Vienna, was painted in 1265 from an original map of about the middle of the third century. It consists of twelve broad strips of parchment on which are represented the parts of the world known to the Romans, except Spain and most of Britain, which are lost. An excellent fac-simile has been published by O. Maier (Ravensburg, 1888), and the map appears on a small scale in J. G. J. Perthes, *Atlas Antiquus* (Gotha, 1893).

CHAPTER V

Tacitus

A prominent figure in the charming literary circle of the Younger Pliny and Suetonius was Tacitus. Little is known of this writer who has played so unique a rôle in the historiography of the early Germans. He was slightly older than the Younger Pliny, and received various favors from Vespasian, Titus and Domitian, and in the reign of Nerva (A. D. 97) was appointed *consul suffectus.* He appears to have survived Trajan, who died in A. D. 117. His historical writings,[1] on which he worked so indefatigably and for which he has been so highly esteemed in modern times, include a biography of his father-in-law Agricola, the Roman general in Britain; the *Historiae,* or contemporary narrative, a detailed account of Roman history from the second consulship of Galba (68) to the death of Domitian (96), of which we have only the first four books in complete form, comprehending the events of barely one year, and part of the fifth book treating of the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus and the war of Civilis in Germany; and the *Annales,* based on other authorities, and covering in 16 books the period from the death of Augustus (14) to the death of Nero (68). Considerable portions of the *Annales* are lost, notably the narrative of Caligula's reign, of the first fifteen years of Claudius and of the last

[1] The best English translation of Tacitus is that of Church & Brodribb (London, 1876-77). See C. Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (Frankfurt, 1893).

two of Nero. The *Annales* and *Historiae* are of notable importance in dealing with the barbarian wars of the first century along the Rhine and Danube, but social conditions of the people receive far less attention than the chief actors, emperors or generals, and there is no evidence that Tacitus himself visited those regions. The style of Tacitus often interferes with his historical accuracy: like Sallust, his display of conscious rhetoric occasionally produces obscurity; he is often intensely epigrammatic; his sketches, usually rapid and brief, become sometimes too minute when he works up a dramatic situation. Then too it must be remembered that the political convictions of Tacitus colored his writings. He was an ardent supporter of the senatorial and aristocratic reaction against the tendency of the times to increase the personal power of the prince. His thoroughly pessimistic view of the condition of Roman society led him into undoubted exaggeration. At any rate, his testimony and opinions in the matter are not confirmed by his genial friend and contemporary, the Younger Pliny,[1] who writes quite pleasantly and hopefully of imperial conditions.

Of greater importance for our purposes than the *Annales* and *Historiae* of Tacitus in his little treatise on the customs and peoples of Germany, commonly called the *Germania.*[2] If we knew more about Tacitus, we might know how seriously to take this twenty-five-page article. In our ignor-

[1] The Letters of the Younger Pliny are translated into English by J. B. Firth, 2 vols. (London, 1900).

[2] An excellent edition is that of H. Furneaux (Oxford, 1894). There is an especially good English translation in the Translations and Reprints of the University of Pennsylvania, vol. vi, number 3, and a fairly literal translation in the Bohn Classical Library. An excellent recent translation of the *Germania* and the *Agricola* is by W. H. Fyfe (Oxford, 1908).

ance, we have been prone to take it very seriously. It purports to describe the geography of Germany, the common religious, social and political customs of the land, and then the respective characteristics of the foremost tribes. Its very uniqueness, its tickling of national vanity through praise of German virtues,[1] the mystery surrounding its composition, the problem of its relative authority, and the impossibility of verifying or controlling many of its statements have conspired to exalt it as the synoptical gospel of German politics and of German economics.

The geography of the *Germania* is as vague and unsatisfactory as that of Strabo and of Pliny, but the description is more detailed in other respects. The country is rude and unattractive in appearance with an inclement atmosphere. The inhabitants are sprung from the soil and are divided into three races: the Ingaevones, those bordering on the ocean; the Herminones, those inhabiting the central parts; and the rest, the Istaevones.

I myself subscribe to the opinion of those who hold that the German tribes have never been contaminated by intermarriage with other nations, but have remained peculiar and unmixed and wholly unlike other people. Hence the bodily type is the same among them all notwithstanding the extent of their numbers: piercing blue eyes, reddish hair, and gigantic stature, fit only for sudden exertion, impatient of labor and toil, and altogether incapable of sustaining heat or thirst.

The Germans celebrate their past in barbarous verse and also sing to stimulate each other to deeds of heroism. Their kings and generals are elective; the power of the former is not absolute, and the latter command more by

[1] Horace had already represented Scythians and Getae in an ideal light in order to bring into relief the corruption of Rome (*carm.* 3, 24, 9).

force of example than from any other kind of authority, on minor concerns of state only their chiefs and princes consult together, but those of greater importance the whole nation determine, and this great council decides judicial matters, fines being paid to the king or to the relatives of the injured party. In battle they put more dependence on infantry than on cavalry, and their columns are not formed by chance but of families, and their women often accompany and incite them. The German youth is equipped with arms as the toga of manhood and attaches himself to some general. The Germans pass the intervals of peace more in sloth than in the chase; the women and the old men do the work. There are no cities, but the tribesmen live separated and in various places, as a spring or a meadow or a grove strikes their fancy. They lay out their settlements not in connected or closely-joined houses, but everyone surrounds his rude hut with an open space, either as a protection against fire or because of ignorance of the art of building. Their land is owned in common and parceled out and worked in turn. Cattle constitute the chief wealth of the Germans, gold and silver not being esteemed more than clay, and iron is not plentiful with them. A long flowing cloak and skins of wild beasts constitute the only clothing. The matrimonial bond is extremely severe and polygamy is seldom practiced. They hate slavery, especially for their women, and the Romans have been more successful in pacifying the Germans by taking women hostages than men. The Germans are very hospitable but are addicted to the evils of drunkenness [1] and gambling. In religion,[2] they worship Mercury most, but also Hercules and

[1] Appian (*Civil Wars*, ii, 64) tells us that the Germans in Caesar's army were especially ridiculous under the influence of liquor and imperiled his chances against Pompey.

[2] In flat contradiction to Caesar. *Cf. supra*, p. 31.

Mars, to whom they consecrate woods and groves. Some of the Suevi also perform sacred rites to Isis. The Germans are superstitious and carefully observe omens and lots. Their funeral rites are not so grand as those of the Romans, it being the province of women, they think, to weep over their friends but of men to remember them.

Whence did Tacitus obtain this information? We gather from his constant use of hearsay and from his few admissions of ignorance that he never visited Germany or knew many Germans at Rome. Tacitus was obviously a scholar and an important figure in the cultured circle of his time. He was interested in history and likewise in current politics. It was natural that he, an authority on the Germanic wars, should be appealed to by his friends to write an essay on the Germans. It was natural, likewise, that the essay should, in the main, take the form of an appreciation. Quite likely, he had talked with Romans who had accompanied the armies into Germany and read little articles and letters about the people; he had very likely seen Germans on the street and heard them talk in their outlandish tongue. It is fair to suppose that he knew as much about Germany as an American historian of the Spanish-American war who had never visited Manila would know about the Philippines. If he were painstaking and conscientious and had no political axe to grind, he might be able to write as authoritatively on the conditions of the Germans and the nice distinctions between tribes as the American could do in describing the social, political and religious customs of the archipelago and in distinguishing the various peoples on the island of Luzon. And if the work of the American historian of the Spanish-American War should alone of all present accounts survive two thousand years hence, our descendants would doubtless pin the same pathetic blind faith to each and

every statement therein contained as we have attached to the slender essay of Tacitus.

We have in fact been painfully victimized by many critics of the *Germania* in the nineteenth century. These scholars have used it as a text for the construction of bulky commentaries until they have credited to the primitive Germans a curious utopian government and a marvellous agrarian socialism. The opinion almost universally accepted before Fustel de Coulanges and Seebohm was based on the interpretations of the Germans, Von Maurer and Waitz, and of the Englishmen, Maine and Stubbs,[1] and was in effect that the German barbarians, when they came into the Roman empire, comprised a stalwart host of blue-eyed, yellow-haired free men, who governed themselves by popular national councils, administered justice by popular local assemblies, and lived together in little village groups of independent yeomen. It was, indeed, recognized that there were gradations of rank and that some individuals were unfortunate enough to be slaves, but these and similar facts were not supposed to affect the general outline of the picture; and even those writers who expressed themselves most guardedly as to this "primitive Teutonic polity" proceeded by the subsequent course of their narrative to assume it as their starting point. And practically the whole theory was formulated from this one little text of Tacitus. The *Germania* created the "primitive Teutonic polity";

[1] The "Germanist" contention is stated by Von Maurer, *Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf-, und Stadt-Verfassung* (1854); G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* (1844); Sir Henry Maine, *Village Communities in East and West* (1871); W. Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*, vol. I (1873). The opposing, or "Romanist," contention is stated by Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France* (1875-1892); Seebohm, *English Village Communities* (1883); Ashley, *Surveys historic and economic* (1891).

the devotees of the " primitive Teutonic polity " adored and magnified the *Germania*. Thus much depended on the reliable information, the unbiased intent and the truthfulness of Tacitus. Of the extent to which he possessed these qualifications, no final positive estimate can be made.

After Tacitus there is nothing on the social order or the institutions of the Germans except a few casual remarks and the much later barbarian codes. On these matters, therefore, we are almost wholly dependent on Caesar, Strabo, and Tacitus; and very few German characteristics stand out certainly, clearly, and uncontradicted by any of the three. It is agreed that the Germans were a primitive race, large of stature and strong, fond of out-door life and license; the men loved perils and piracy, warfare and the chase; the women were held in high repute and did most of the work; towns and cities were seemingly regarded with aversion; work was mainly agricultural, cattle constituting the chief wealth, and the people making common use of the fields and woods surrounding them; Germanic political organization was tribal and each head of a family had absolute power over his household; the king or chieftain of the tribe was usually chosen from among the nobles, but his power was limited, and government seems to have been aristocratic rather than monarchical; the Germans were hospitable but addicted to laziness, gambling and intemperance. These points of agreement in the sources are small and unsatisfactory, and admit of wide differences of interpretation. Any more definite or detailed statement, moreover, is sure to find contradiction by ancients and create learned dissension among moderns.[1] The same

[1] Thus the *Gefolge*, which has been generally received as an institution peculiarly Germanic and has supplied a topic for endless discussion, is treated by Tacitus more specifically than by the earlier writers. This fact has led even the cautious Fustel de Coulanges into making elab-

general statements could with propriety be applied to the customs of almost any primitive people, even the early Greeks or Romans. We do know from the sources at hand that the customs of the early Germans were more primitive and less developed than those of the contemporary subjects of the empire.

In reading Caesar or Tacitus, it should be remembered that the Germans they knew may have been quite different from the Germans with Clovis or Theodoric. The customs of the early Germans could not well be stereotyped or uniform. Various contemporary tribes probably differed considerably in habits and mode of life; and it is beyond doubt that during the four centuries which elapsed from Caesar's Suevic campaign to the migrations of the Visigoths, internecine strife, contact with Roman civilization, and natural development altered the German customs, yet never to such a degree that during that time the German in Germany attained to anywhere near the civilization of the Roman even in Gaul. The most obvious feature of the Germanic invasions is the conflict between a higher and a lower order of development and civilization.

orate speculations on the development of the *Gefolge* among the Germans between the time of Caesar and that of Tacitus, which may or may not have been the case.

CHAPTER VI

Narrative Sources of the Second, Third and Fourth Centuries

The historians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, Dio Cassius, Herodian, the writers of the so-called Augustan Histories, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor and Ammianus Marcellinus, discuss, in some cases at considerable length, various campaigns against German armies and marauders along the Danube and the Rhine; they occasionally and incidentally mention Germans within the empire and acquaint us indirectly with the wholesale peaceful immigration of barbarians into Roman territory; they give but few hints of German customs.

Dio Cassius[1] was born about 155 at Nicaea in Bithynia. His father was a Roman senator and had been governor of Dalmatia and Cilicia, and he himself entered public service at Rome in 180 and thenceforth steadily advanced until his retirement in 229. He was made senator under Commodus, prefect of Pergamum and Smyrna under Macrinus, and governor in turn of Africa, Dalmatia and Upper Pannonia under Alexander Severus. His history[2] in eighty

[1] Sometimes written Cassius Dio. The historian belonged to the gens Cassia (his father was Cassius Apronianus) and he took Dio as cognomen from his maternal grandfather, Dio Chrysostom.

[2] The best text of Dio Cassius is edited by U. P. Boissevain, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1895-1901). The text of L. Dindorf, revised by J. Melber, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1890-1894) is much used and good. There is an admirable English translation by H. B. Foster (Troy, N. Y., 1905-1906). On Dio Cassius, Herodian, and contemporaries, see A. Schäfer, *Quellenkunde d. gr.-röm. Gesch.* (Leipzig, 1885).

books, covering Roman affairs from the arrival of Aeneas in Italy to his own day, was undertaken on the suggestion of Septimius Severus and completed after the author's retirement in 229. One of the extant fragments [1] suggests its scope and some of its characteristics:

I am anxious to write a history of everything worth remembering which the Romans have done whether at peace or in war, so as to omit nothing essential of these matters or of others. . . . But I have been forced to make selections in my history. Do not entertain suspicions, nevertheless, as in the case of certain other writers, regarding the truth of my history merely because I have used elaborate diction wherever the subject matter permitted, for I have been anxious to be equally perfect in both respects, so far as in me lies. I will begin at the point where I have obtained the clearest accounts of what is reported to have taken place in this land which we inhabit.

The work presented only a summary of events to the time of Julius Caesar, but then expanded, especially from the time of Commodus. Books thirty-six to sixty, covering the period from 68 B. C. to A. D. 60, survive in complete form, except for a gap in book fifty-five. The earlier books were largely used by Zonaras, a Greek monk of the twelfth century, whose epitome we possess, and there are also fragments in the compilations made for Constantine VII in the tenth century.[2] Of the last twenty books we have only fragments and the meager abridgment which Xiphilinus, a monk of the eleventh century, prepared at the order of Michael VII, Parapinaces. Dio Cassius had a wide knowl-

[1] Frag. i.

[2] *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis,* and the *Excerpta de legationibus.* See *infra,* p. 99.

edge of contemporary events and spoke with authority. He wrote in Greek and expressed himself clearly and, so far as we can judge, accurately in the main. His references to the barbarians are not as numerous as we might anticipate; he subordinated other events to the relations of the emperor with the senate.

Of the life of Herodian, we know practically nothing. He says that he was a contemporary of the events he narrates in the eight small books written in Greek and covering the period from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the reign of Gordian III (180-238).[1] Herodian's remarks are soporific and his work is not highly esteemed. His importance rests in the conviction that he was an honest-intentioned contemporary.

The Augustan Histories[2] seem to have been a compilation from a number of different and originally independent histories written in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine. They comprise imperial biographies from Hadrian to Numerianus (117-284), and supply many details not mentioned elsewhere. The authorship of some of the histories has been disputed, but Mr. Bury[3] gives the following convenient tabulated view of the contributions now generally ascribed to the various biographers:

[1] Edited by L. Mendelssohn (Leipzig, 1883). See J. Kreutzer's dissertation, *De Herodiano rerum Romanorum scriptore* (Bonn, 1881).

[2] *Augustae Historiae Scriptores.* The best text is that of H. Peter, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1884). The only English translation is by J. Bernard (London, 1740).

[3] See his edition of Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Appendix, vol. i, pp. 445-7. Some critics, including O. Seeck, have assigned the collection to the fifth century, but the greater number agree with Mr. Bury. Mommsen pointed out that the original edition must have been revised and added to after the time of Diocletian and Constantine.

Aelius Spartianus	Hadrian	I	Date: before May, 305.
	Aelius Verus	II	
	Didius Julianus	IX	
	Severus	X	
	Pescennius Niger	XI	
	Caracallus	XIII	
Vulcacius Gallicanus	Avidius Cassius	VI	Date: before May, 305.
Julius Capitolinus	Antoninus Pius	III	Date: reign of Constantine.
	Marcus Antoninus	IV	
	Verus	V	
	Pertinax	VIII	
	Clodius Albinus	XII	
	Maximini duo	XIX	
	Gordiani tres	XX	
	Maximus et Balbinus	XXI	
Aelius Lampridius	Commodus	VII	Date: reign of Constantine.
	Diadumenus	XVI	
	Heliogabalus	XVII	
	Alexander Severus	XVIII	
Trebellius Pollio	Valeriani duo	XXII	Date: before May, 305.
	Gallieni duo	XXIII	
	Tyranni triginta	XXIV	
	Claudius	XXV	
Flavius Vopiscus	Aurelian to Carinus	XXVI to XXX	Date: after May, 305, and begun before July, 306.
Uncertain	Geta	XIV	
	Opilius Macrinus	XV	

The principal source[1] for the earlier lives was Marius Maximus (*cca.* 170-230), who had continued the work of Suetonius without pretension to higher criticism. That the writers likewise had access to the imperial archives we

[1] It has been claimed by certain recent critics that the writers of the Augustan Histories drew considerably from an anonymous, hypothetical biographer who flourished in the age of the Severi. See E. Kornemann, *Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom* (Leipzig, 1905), and O. T. Schulz, *Das Kaiserhaus der Antonine und der letzte Historiker Roms* (Leipzig, 1907).

gather from the introduction to the life of Aurelian by Vopiscus:

The rites had been celebrated with great rejoicing, which, we know, ought to accompany every festival, when the prefect of the city, Junius Tiberianus, an eminent gentleman, whom I mention with great respect, had me get into his state litter. Then, while his mind rested from cases and public business, he chatted with me from the palace as far as the Valerian gardens, and the conversation turned on the life of the princes. When we came to the Temple of the Sun, dedicated by Aurelian, whence he himself was descended, he asked me who had written that emperor's life. "I have never read one in Latin," I replied, "but I have read several in Greek." Whereat the good man expressed his regret in these words: "Thus Thersites, Sinon and other like prodigies of antiquity we know perfectly and posterity will also know; but the deified Aurelian, a most famous prince, a most austere emperor, by whom the whole world has been restored to the Roman name, posterity will not know! Heaven avert such stupidity! If I mistake not, however, we have the written diary of this man and also the authentic notes on his wars: I wish you would take them, arrange them in order and add details of his life. They are in the official annals which have to be recorded every day and which you will be able to study carefully. I shall also put at your disposal the annals of the Ulpian library. Thus you can compose a life of Aurelian, which I wish you would do." I assented. I received Greek books and surrounded myself with all necessary documents. From these sources whatever was worthy of relation I have brought together in one little book. Please accept my present, and if you are not satisfied, read the original Greeks and order the official manuscripts which the Ulpian library will send you whenever you desire.

Would that we might now read the original Greeks and receive those manuscripts from the Ulpian library! The Augustan Histories are full of personal anecdotes and trivial

details,[1] but are seldom interesting and never profound. They are important because they are almost the only considerable source for a part of the period they cover. The very paucity of extant contemporary accounts makes it impossible to determine their accuracy. It has been established with tolerable certainty [2] that all the original documents inserted by Trebellius Pollio, whether letters, speeches or laws, are forgeries.

Eutropius, who served in the expedition of Julian against the Parthians, wrote, among other works, a Latin abridgment in ten books of Roman history from the foundation of the city to the death of Jovian in 364.[3] It is a brief, bald outline with a few details relating to third and fourth century history which are not to be found in other extant works.

Aurelius Victor flourished in the middle of the fourth century, was governor of Pannonia under Julian and city prefect under Theodosius the Great, and prepared a series of short biographies of emperors from Augustus to Constantius.[4] Three other little treatises are sometimes ascribed to Aurelius Victor, but apparently without foundation: a legendary account of the beginnings of the Roman people before Romulus; lives of illustrious persons from Romulus and Remus to Cleopatra; and an epitome of imperial biographies from Augustus to Theodosius. The first mentioned work is founded on Suetonius and his continuators and is very slender.

[1] The authors frequently mention as a source for the pettiest details, especially of the less known emperors, the work of Aelius Junius Cordus.

[2] See A. Gemoll, *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Leipzig, 1886).

[3] The best edition is that of H. Droysen in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. ii (Berlin, 1879). There is an English translation by J. S. Watson in the Bohn Classical Library.

[4] Edited by F. Pichlmayr (Munich, 1892).

By far the best and most important historical contribution of the period is the Latin work of Ammianus Marcellinus. The work tells all we know about the author: he was a native of Antioch and a soldier, a member of the imperial body-guard, served under Julian against the Parthians, and composed his history at Rome toward the end of the fourth century. The history [1] is divided into thirty-one books and originally began with the accession of Nerva (A. D. 96), where Tacitus and Suetonius end, and was continued to the death of Valens (378), a period of 282 years. The first thirteen books, however, are lost, so that the extant work embraces only twenty-five years prior to the death of Valens.

Ammianus was a soldier first and foremost and was chiefly concerned with deeds of war. Nearly all his statements about military matters appear to be founded on his own observations or upon information derived from trustworthy eye-witnesses, and he is the best guide to the Germanic campaigns of Constantius II, Julian, Valentinian, Gratian and Valens. The following extract may illustrate the grasp of Ammianus on his subject and his clarity and sanity of description. It relates to the efforts of Constantius to repress the Sarmatians and Quadi: [2]

While the emperor was passing the winter quietly at Sirmium,[3] he received frequent and grave tidings that the Sarmatians and the Quadi, two tribes contiguous to each other, and similar in manners and mode of warfare, were conjointly raiding Pannonia and the second Moesia, in straggling detachments.

[1] The Teubner text of Ammianus is edited by V. Gardthausen (Leipzig, 1874). There is an English translation in the Bohn Classical Library by C. D. Yonge (London, 1862).

[2] A. D. 358. Ammianus, xvii, 12.

[3] In Lower Pannonia. Modern Widdin?

These tribes are more suited to robbery than to regular war; they carry long spears, and wear breastplates made of scraped and polished horn, tucked into linen jackets, so that the layers of horn are like the feathers of a bird. They ride over vast spaces whether in pursuit or in retreat, their horses being swift and manageable; and they take with them one or sometimes two spare chargers apiece, in order that the change may keep up the strength of the beasts and their vigor be preserved by alternations of rest.

The Sarmatians were pronounced independent of any other power, as having been always vassals of the Romans; and they willingly embraced the proposal of giving hostages as a pledge of the maintenance of peace. . . . There were formerly natives of this kingdom, of noble birth and powerful, but a secret conspiracy armed their slaves against them; and as among barbarians all right consists in might, they, being equal to their masters in ferocity, and superior in number, completely overcame them. The nobles losing all their prudence in their fear, fled to the Victohali [a tribe of Goths], afar off, thinking it better in the choice of evils to become subject to their protectors than slaves to their own servants. But after they had obtained pardon from us, and been received as faithful allies, they sorrowfully besought our direct protection. Moved by the undeserved hardships of their lot, the emperor, in the presence of the army, addressed them assembled before him with kind words and commanded them to own no masters save himself and the Roman generals. And that the restoration of their liberty might carry with it additional dignity, he made Zizais their king, a man, as the event proved, deserving the rewards of eminent fortune and faithful. After these glorious deeds no one was allowed to depart till all our prisoners had returned, as we had before insisted . . .

Ammianus, in the midst of his military chronicle, introduces from time to time highly interesting and valuable digressions. Such are his notices of the institutions and customs of the Scythians and Sarmatians (XVII, 12), of

the Huns and Alani (XXXI, 2), and his geographical discussions upon Gaul (XV, 9), Pontus (XXII, 8) and Thrace (XXVII, 4). His description of the Alani is as follows:

They are a people who, though widely separated, wander like nomads over enormous districts, and who, united in the course of time under one name, are collectively called Alani. . . . They have no huts, and never use the plough, but live on meat and plenty of milk, and mounted on wagons, which are covered with curved-bark awnings, they drive through boundless deserts. And when they come to pasture-land, they pitch their wagons in a circle, and live like a herd of beasts, eating up all the forage—carrying their cities, as it were, on wagons. In them the husbands sleep with their wives—in them their children are born and reared; they are in short their perpetual habitation, and wherever they go, that place they look upon as their true home. They feed their flocks and herds as they go; and they are especially careful of their horses. The fields there are always green, and are interspersed with patches of fruit trees, so that, wherever they go, there is no dearth of food or fodder. This is caused by the moisture of the soil and the numerous rivers which flow through these districts. All their old people, and especially all the weaker sex, keep close to the wagons, and occupy themselves with light work. But the young men, who from earliest childhood are trained to the use of horses, think it beneath them to walk. They are also all trained by varied discipline to become skilful warriors. And this is the reason why the Persians, who were originally of Scythian extraction, are very skilful in war.

Nearly all the Alani are tall and handsome; their hair is somewhat yellow, their eyes are terribly fierce; the lightness of their armor renders them quick; and they are in every respect almost equal to the Huns, being even more civilized in their food and manners. They plunder and hunt as far as the Sea of Azov and the Cimmerian Bosphorus, ravaging also Armenia and Media. And as ease is a delightful thing to men of a quiet and placid disposition, so danger and war are a

pleasure to the Alani, and that man among them is judged happy who has lost his life in battle. For those who grow old, or who go out of the world by accidental death, they pursue with bitter reproaches as degenerate and cowardly. Nor is there anything of which they boast with more pride than of having killed a man: and as glorious spoils they esteem the scalps which they have torn from the heads of the slain, and with which they adorn their war-horses. Nor is there any temple or shrine seen in their country, nor even any cabin thatched with straw, but a naked sword is plunged into the ground with barbaric ceremonies, and that they worship with great respect, as Mars, the presiding deity of the regions over which they wander. They foretell the future in a remarkable manner; for collecting a number of straight twigs of osier, and separating them with certain secret incantations at an appointed time, they learn clearly what is about to happen. They have no idea of slavery, inasmuch as they themselves are all born of noble families; and the "judges" they even now elect are men of proved experience in war . . .[1]

Ammianus appears to have no particular bias. Though probably a pagan, he never speaks disrespectfully of Christianity; though a warm admirer of Julian, he is frank in criticizing the shortcomings of that prince;[2] though a Latin writer, he admires the Greeks; and though a soldier in the east, he writes well of the expeditions in the west. He is interested, though not always judiciously, in geological speculations upon earthquakes, in astronomical inquiries into eclipses and comets, in zoological theories on the destruction of lions by mosquitos, in medical researches into the origin of epidemics. Above all, Ammianus has a liberal share of common sense.

[1] xxxi, 2, 17-25.

[2] "His forbidding masters of rhetoric and grammar to instruct Christians was a cruel action and one deserving to be buried in everlasting silence."—xxii, 10.

CHAPTER VII

Relations of the Germans to the Empire from Julius Caesar to Theodosius the Great

The sources so far treated tell a very imperfect story of the Germans and their contact with the empire during four centuries. In some cases, the deficiencies of the story can be supplied by later sources,—always a dangerous practice. A rapid survey in this chapter of the relations between the Romans and their northern neighbors from the time of Julius Caesar to the close of the history of Ammianus Marcellinus may suffice to give some idea of how a great variety of sources [1] have to be patched together in order to admit of anything like a connected narrative.

Caesar himself, as we have seen, made two short expeditions across the Rhine, and it is interesting to note that he used Germans in some of the hardest fights of the Gallic war [2] as well as at Pharsalus, Alexandria and Philippi.[3] Ravages along the Rhine occurred in 30 or 29 B. C.[4] and Augustus undertook not only to safeguard the Rhine boundary but to erect a Roman province on the other side. His generals, Agrippa, Lollius Paulinus, Drusus, and Tiberius,[5] contended with varying success against the Germans, but

[1] Some of the sources mentioned in the foot-notes of this chapter are treated in following chapters.

[2] *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, vii, 67, 70, 80.

[3] Appian, ii, 64.

[4] Dio Cassius, li, 21.

[5] The principal sources for these campaigns are Dio Cassius, Tacitus, Velleius Paterculus and Florus.

the defeat of Varus by the Roman-educated Arminius broke down the headship of Augustus in Germany. The efforts of Augustus, however, were far from fruitless, for two Roman provinces, the Upper and Lower Germany, were formed on the right bank of the Rhine, and there arose important trading towns.

Under Tiberius, the defeat of Varus was completely avenged by Germanicus, but thenceforth the emperor aimed merely to keep the Germans at home in peace and to prevent hostile incursions into the empire. During the reigns of Claudius and Nero, we read of constant unrest, of broils among the Germans, and of appeals for grants of land within the empire. Germans took an active part in the civil wars which followed the death of Nero. Vitellius had German auxiliaries in his army,[1] and Vespasian took into his service two kings of the Suevi "whose old obedience to Rome he knew." [2] The Suevi, in fact, fought in the first ranks at the battle of Cremona.[3] At the same time, the Batavian Civilis caused a defection of eight cohorts, brought a German army into Gaul, and occupied Trier and Langres, but was finally glad to return to the islands in the Rhine as an ally of the commonwealth.[4]

Even in this earlier period of the principate we find German settlements within the empire and German troops serving beside the legions. Tiberius from one of his expeditions led back forty thousand Germans, to whom he "assigned lands to cultivate on the left bank of the Rhine." [5] Tacitus mentions the Batavians and Mattiaci who entered the empire as subjects.[6] There were also German cohorts

[1] Tacitus, *History*, i, 61. [2] *Ibid.*, iii, 5. [3] *Ibid.*, iii, 21.

[4] The account of this enterprise fills a great part of the fourth and fifth books of the *History* of Tacitus.

[5] Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 9. [6] Tacitus, *Germania*, 29.

in Italy and even at Rome. There were some in the imperial guards bivouacked in the palace who were always faithful.[1]

A wall against the Germans had been built by Drusus along the Rhine. Domitian went further and planned to join the Rhine with the Danube. This wall Trajan continued and Hadrian seems to have completed. From Domitian until Marcus Aurelius the Germans were fairly quiet, although we find immigrations and ravages of Chauki in Belgium, Chatti in Gaul, and Marcomanni crossing the Rhine, to the last of whom Trajan granted lands in Dacia.[2]

Pressure against the Roman frontiers was renewed towards the middle of the second century. Marcus Aurelius struggled twenty years against the barbarians. Many peoples "pressed by other barbarians, asked to be received into the empire," [3] and marched to Aquileia, but they retreated on the approach of a Roman army, and, in order to obtain peace, massacred such of their chieftains as were hostile to the empire. The Quadi promised to submit the election of

[1] Tacitus, *Annals,* i, 24; xiii, 18; xv, 58; Suetonius, *Augustus,* 49, *Caligula,* 55, *Nero,* 34, *Galba,* 12; Dio Cassius, lvi, 23; Herodian, iv, 13, 6; Julius Capitolinus, *Maximus and Balbinus,* 14.

[2] Trajan made several expeditions across the Danube and erected the province of Dacia north of that river. Trajan's Dacia must be distinguished from "Dacia ripensis" south of the Danube, a province formed at a much later date. H. Schiller emphasizes the importance of the Dacian War in transferring the military center of the empire from the Rhine to the Danube (H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaizerzeit,* vol. i, p. 554). Trajan wrote a work on his expeditions, which unfortunately is lost, and our only contemporary sources are monumental, such as the column of Trajan, the scenes on which have been published in fine photographic reproductions by G. Arosa & C. E. L. W. Froehner (Paris, 1872-74).

[3] Julius Capitolinus, *Marcus,* 14, 17, 22, 72; Dio Cassius, lxxi, 11, 19, 20.

their king to the emperor's confirmation. An extensive struggle against the Germans, generally called the Marcomannic War, lasted with short intervals of peace from 167 until the accession of Commodus in 180.[1] Many peoples were engaged: Marcomanni, Quadi, Narisci, Victohali, Hermunduri, Buri, Vandals and the Sarmatian Iazyges. Marcus Aurelius was generally successful and settled large numbers of conquered barbarians within the limits of the empire.[2] Of eight thousand Iazyges whom he enrolled in his army, he sent a large part to Britain.[3] He admitted the Astinges to Roman soil with the title of subjects on condition that they should always fight the enemies of Rome.[4] He received the title of Germanicus, for the Romans applied "the name *Germans* to all those who dwell in the northern regions."[5] Marcus Aurelius habitually employed German mercenaries,[6] and Commodus followed his example.[7] It was later a German in the imperial bodyguard who struck the first blow at Pertinax.[8]

During the third century, the barbarian inroads grew both in frequency and in damage inflicted. The Germans moved into the empire in increasing numbers. From the time of Commodus to that of Diocletian, we find in the west all the territory north of the Rhine abandoned by the

[1] On the war, see Julius Capitolinus, *Marcus;* Dio Cassius, lxxi, 3, 5, 7, 11-21, 33; Ammianus, xxxi, 5.

[2] They were settled mainly as *coloni,* for an admirable account of which, see B. Heisterbergk, *Die Entstehung des Kolonats* (Leipzig, 1876).

[3] Dio Cassius, lxxi, 11, 16.

[4] Dio Cassius, lxxi, 12.

[5] Dio Cassius, lxxi, 3.

[6] Julius Capitolinus, *Marcus,* 21.

[7] Dio Cassius, lxxiii, 2.

[8] Julius Capitolinus, *Pertinax,* 11.

emperors, and in the east the Goths and their allies gradually victorious along the Danube.

Caracalla administered a check to the Alamanni in 213.[1] Under Alexander Severus (222-235), Gaul was pillaged by German raiders,[2] but death prevented the emperor from going to the rescue of his provincials. His successor, Maximin (235-238), however, continued his project, penetrated into Germany, "burned the villages, carried off the flocks, killed many enemies, led away innumerable captives."[3] A little later, the Carpi plundered the country about the Ister but were defeated by Philip (241-249).[4]

The reign of Decius (249-251) was marked by war with the Goths, the first considerable occasion on which that people appear in history.[5] There were various incursions and attacks, notably the sieges of Marcianopolis, the capital of the Second Moesia, and of Philippopolis in Thrace, and finally in 251 the battle of Forum Trebonii in Scythia, in which the emperor and his son lost their lives. Gallus made peace with the Goths, permitting them to carry off all the plunder and the noblest captives, besides engaging to pay them annually a large sum of money.[6]

[1] Dio Cassius, lxxvii, 12. The identification of the Suevi and Alamanni is very uncertain; *cf.* Gibbon, vol. i, p. 258 (Bury's edition), and Bury's note.

[2] Aelius Lampridius, *Alexander Severus,* 59.

[3] Julius Capitolinus, *Maximini,* 12; Herodian, vii, 2.

[4] Zosimus, i, 20.

[5] It has been accepted that the Goths were identical with the Guttones whom Pliny mentions (*Natural History,* iv, 14), and with the Gotones of Tacitus (*Germania,* 43).

[6] The main authority for the Gothic wars of Decius and Gallus is Dexippus, who held office in Athens at the time and commanded a Roman army, and who, according to Trebellius Pollio (*Gallienus,* 13), was a "writer as well as a general." Photius, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, says that Dexippus wrote a history of

Inroads were constant throughout the troubled reigns of Valerian (253-260) and Gallienus, both in the east and in the west. The Franks invaded Gaul about 256,[1] and the provincials could not prevent them "from traversing the whole of Gaul and pillaging it and penetrating into Spain." They ravaged Spain for twelve years, the greater part of the reign of Gallienus, and sacked Tarragona, the capital of the province.[2] Postumus at the head of the armies in Gaul at length endeavored to repress the invaders and drive them beyond the Rhine, but his death was the signal for new incursions. The barbarians took and burned several cities until checked by Lollianus. Then came Victorinus and Tetricus, of whom it is said, "they were given by Providence to prevent the Germans from seizing the soil of the empire."[3] Meanwhile (*cca.* 256-7) the Alamanni entered Italy and after advancing as far as Ravenna were defeated by Gallienus. Somewhat later (*cca.* 259-260), they were repulsed from Rome by the senate and people, and, being attacked by the emperor on their retreat, suf-

Macedonia from the time of Alexander the Great, a chronicle from earliest times to A. D. 268, and an account of the wars with the Goths in which Dexippus had himself fought. Fragments of these works, which are fairly numerous, have appeared in the Bonn edition and have also been edited by C. Müller in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum,* vol. iii. Frag. 18 in the latter describes at length the siege of Marcianopolis, and frag. 20 an ineffectual siege of Philippopolis. For the battle of Forum Trebonii (modern Dobrudŝa), see frag. 16, besides Zosimus, i, 23; Jordanes, 18; and Zonaras, xii, 20. The chronicle of Dexippus was continued to the year 404 by Eunapius (see *infra,* p. 89).

[1] The first time that we hear of this celebrated confederacy, although most of the individual tribes which composed it are heard of as early as the time of Augustus.

[2] Eutropius, ix, 6; Orosius, vii, 22, 8.

[3] Trebellius Pollio, *Gallienus,* 4; *Tyranni triginta,* 5; Eusebius, *Chronicon, a.* 260.

fered great loss.[1] At the same time the eastern provinces were similarly troubled. Goths destroyed Pityus on the coast of Circassia (*cca.* 258), and, crossing the Black Sea in boats, plundered various cities of Bithynia. Later they made other naval expeditions through the Bosphorus and the Aegean Sea, and ravaged Greece. They seem to have spared the Greek monuments,[2] but their fierce attack on Thessalonica thoroughly aroused Illyricum and was probably the immediate cause of the restoration of the walls of Athens. The barbarians were at length scattered by Gallienus, and a chieftain of the Heruli entered the service of Rome with a large body of his countrymen, and was invested with the ornaments of consular rank.[3]

Under Claudius II (268-270) the eastern provinces suffered most at the hands of the Germans. A multitude of Goths and other tribes again embarked on ships, and, sail-

[1] "Alamanni," according to Gibbon, was a collective term for several different tribes, to denote at once their various lineage and their common bravery, from an etymology preserved by Asinius Quadratus, an original historian, quoted by Agathias (i, 5). Mr. Bury suggests the derivation *Alah-mannen,* "men of the sanctuary," referring to the wood of the Semnones. On these invasions of Italy, see Flavius Vopiscus, *Aurelianus,* 18, 21; Dexippus, *Fragmenta,* vol. iii, p. 682; Orosius, vii, 22; Zosimus, i, 37; Zonaras, xii, 24; Eutropius, ix, 8.

[2] Syncellus mentions the presence of barbarians at Athens (*a.* 267), and Zonaras (xii, 26) seems to be the author of the story that the libraries were spared by the Goths so that the Greeks in the future as in the past might waste their manhood in poring over wearisome volumes and thus fall an easy prey to the strong unlettered sons of the north. *Cf.* Dexippus, *Fragmenta,* 5, 6. The chronicle of the Byzantine monk and physician, Georgius Syncellus (*i. e.,* Private Secretary), extending from Adam to Diocletian, was prepared as late as the end of the eighth century. Zonaras wrote in the twelfth century.

[3] Trebellius Pollio, *Gallienus,* 13; Zosimus, i, 35-9; Orosius, vii, 22; Dexippus, *Fragment* 21; Zonaras, xii, 26; Syncellus, vol. i, p. 717 (Bonn edition). On the invasion of Greece, *cf.* Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* (1889), vol. i, p. 16 *et seq.*

ing through the Black and Aegean Seas, attempted an irruption into the empire on a larger scale than before; but many perished in shipwrecks, many were overwhelmed in the mountains near Thessalonica, and the rest, after ravaging Macedonia for some time, were conquered by the imperial troops. "All who survived were either admitted into the Roman legions or had lands assigned them to cultivate and so became husbandmen." In 268 Claudius had to face a coalition of Alamanni, Grethungi, Tervingi and other nations; but he met and defeated them near Lake Garda. After the victories of the emperor and his lieutenants we are told that "the provinces were filled with slaves and German cultivators, and that there was no country where Gothic slaves were not to be seen." [1]

Aurelian (270-275) stopped an irruption of Alamanni, and defeated the Marcomanni who had crossed the Alps and reached Milan, and are thenceforth heard of no more.[2] He likewise checked expeditions of Goths and of Vandals, with the latter of whom he concluded a treaty by which the barbarians engaged to supply the Roman armies with two thousand cavalry, and in return were guaranteed a safe retreat and a regular market at the Danube provided by the emperor but supported at their own expense.[3] It was in all probability Aurelian who finally abandoned the Dacian province north of the Danube: "the emperor withdrew his army and left Dacia to the provincials, despairing of being able to retain it, and the peoples led forth from thence he settled in Moesia, and made there a province

[1] Zosimus (i, 40-6) deals chiefly with the maritime invaders; Trebellius Pollio (*Claudius*) with those who came by land. *Cf.* Eutropius, ix, 11; Eusebius, *Chronicon;* Zonaras, xii, 26.

[2] Vopiscus, *Probus,* 12; *Aurelian,* 18; Ammianus, xxxi, 5, 17; Zosimus, i, 49.

[3] Vopiscus, *Aurel.,* 14, 15; Dexippus, p. 19, Bonn ed.; Zosimus, i, 48.

which he called his own Dacia, and which now divides the two Moesias." [1]

While Tacitus (275-276) was repulsing the Goths in Asia,[2] Gaul was incessantly ravaged and sixty towns were occupied by Germans. But Probus (276-282) delivered the hard-pressed province (277), and in turn invaded the country of the Germans, obtaining so many *coloni* that he could write to the senate: "Now the barbarians labor for you, sow for you." "Probus," says his biographer, "took as much booty in Germany as Germans had seized in the empire." [3] Probus made an alliance with the Gothic peoples (278).[4] During his reign, an adventurous expedition of Franks who had been settled on the seacoast of Pontus, made an all-water trip to their native Frisian shores, plundering as they went.[5] Probus transported considerable numbers of Vandals into Britain; [6] and a hundred thousand Bastarnae cheerfully accepted an establishment in Thrace, and lived in accordance with Roman laws and Roman customs.[7]

Diocletian (284-305) received the title of "Germanicus Maximus" [8] in consequence of his successes against the Germans in the Danubian provinces, and his colleagues were constantly engaged with the barbarians. Maximian checked ravages in Gaul (286-7) and even regained some foothold beyond the Rhine,[9] but the Franks continued to pillage

[1] Vopiscus, *Aurelian*, 39.

[2] Vopiscus, *Tacitus*, 13; Zosimus, i, 63; Zonaras, xii, 28.

[3] Vopiscus, *Probus*, 13, 14, 15, 18; Eutropius, ix, 25; Zosimus, i, 67-8.

[4] Vopiscus, *Probus*, 16.

[5] *Panegyr. Vet.*, ed. E. Bährens, p. 145; Zosimus, i, 71.

[6] Zosimus, i, 68.

[7] Vopiscus, *Probus*, 18; Zosimus, i, 71.

[8] *Cf. Corp. Insc. Lat.*, vi, 1116.

[9] Mamertinus, *Pan. Max.*, 5, 6, 10; *Genethl. Max.*, 17.

Rhenish cities.[1] Constantius Chlorus rebuilt the ruined towns of Autun and Trier, settled many Frankish *coloni* in Gaul, and defeated (298) a large expedition of Alamanni who had penetrated as far as Langres.[2] The king of the Alamanni, Crocus, with an independent body of his own subjects, later became an ally of Constantius.[3]

Constantine's administration of Gaul (306-312) was marked by a signal victory over the Franks and Alamanni, several of whose princes were exposed by his order to the wild beasts of the amphitheatre.[4] The civil wars which filled the early years of the fourth century between Constantine and Maxentius and Constantine and Licinius contributed in no small measure to the numbers and power of the barbarians within the empire. The army of Constantine at the battle of the Milvian Bridge was composed in great part of Germans. Constantine is reproached [5] for having changed and weakened the military system of the empire by withdrawing troops from the forts which Diocletian had established on the frontiers, in order to supply small garrisons for the cities of the interior.

In 331 Constantine was asked by Sarmatians [6] to inter-

[1] *Incert. Pan. Constant. Caesar,* 21; Mamertinus, *Genethl. Max.,* 7.

[2] Mamertinus, *Pan. Max.,* 5; *Incert. Pan. Constantio Caes.,* 2, 3; Eusebius, *Chronicon, a.* 297.

[3] Victor Junior, *Epitome,* 41.

[4] Eutropius, x, 3; *Panegyr. Vet.,* vii, 10-12.

[5] By Zosimus (ii, 51), who is deemed decidedly unfair to Constantine.

[6] It used to be supposed that "Sarmatian" was a generic name for Slavonic peoples, but it is more than doubtful whether the Roman writers felt or expressed such nice distinctions. The work of Šafařik (*Slawische Alterthümer,* ed. Wuttke, vol. i, pp. 333 *et seq.*) has settled almost beyond a doubt that the chief Sarmatian peoples were not Slavonic. That some Slavonic tribes were included in the barbarian settlements made in the Illyrian peninsula by Roman emperors of the

vene in a feud existing between them and the Goths; and the emperor defeated the Gothic king who had ventured to enter Moesia the following year, and compelled him to agree to supply the imperial armies with forty thousand soldiers.[1] Constantine later had trouble with the Sarmatians, accounts of which are confused and conflicting,[2] although it is clear that numbers were settled within the empire and that the emperor himself was called "Sarmaticus."

Immigration increased under Constantius II (337-361). Franks, Alamanni and Saxons, perceiving the fords of the Rhine unprotected, penetrated into Gaul and took forty towns near the river. Sarmatians and Quadi plundered Pannonia and Upper Moesia without opposition.[3] The emperor undertook an expedition against the Alamanni in 354 but made peace on easy terms because "his fortune was propitious only in civil troubles and when foreign wars were undertaken it often proved disastrous."[4]

Constantius was agitated by frequent intelligence that the Gallic provinces were in a lamentable condition since no adequate resistance could be made to the barbarians who were now laying waste the whole country. And after deliberating a long time, in great anxiety, by what force he might repel these dangers (himself remaining in Italy, as he thought it very dangerous to go into so remote a country), he at last determined on the wise plan of associating with himself in the cares

third and fourth centuries, is an hypothesis to account for the appearance of Slavonic names in the Illyrian provinces. See Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren.*

[1] Zosimus, ii, 21; Jordanes, ch. 21.

[2] Ammianus, xvii, 12; Eutropius, x, 7; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini,* iv, 6; Anonymus Valesianus, i; Sextus Rufus, *De Provinciis,* 26; Jerome, *Chronicon;* and the historians of the Church.

[3] Zosimus, iii, 1.

[4] Ammianus, xiv, 10.

of the empire his cousin Julian, whom he had some time before summoned to court, and who still retained the robe he had worn in the Greek schools.[1]

Thus Julian was sent into Gaul with the authority of a Caesar . . . at a time when the barbarians had stormed many towns and were besieging others, when there was everywhere direful devastation, and when the Roman empire was tottering. With but a moderate force he cut off vast numbers of Alamanni at Strasburg,[2] a Gallic city, took prisoner their famous king and relieved Gaul. Many other honorable achievements were afterwards performed by Julian against the barbarians, the Germans being driven beyond the Rhine and the Roman empire extended to its former limits.[3]

[Meanwhile Constantius suppressed the raids of the Quadi and Sarmatians in Moesia and Pannonia and prescribed that they should] own no masters save himself and the Roman generals. And that the restoration of their liberty might carry with it additional dignity, he made Zizais their king, a man, as developments proved, deserving the rewards of eminent fortune and faithful.[4]

The short reign of Julian after the death of Constantius and the shorter reign of Jovian (363-4) were occupied with Persian wars; and Valentinian (364-375), on assuming imperial power, found plenty to do in pacifying the northern barbarians. One of his first acts was to associate

[1] Ammianus, xv, 8. A. D. 355.

[2] This battle is described by Ammianus in great detail, xvi, 12. For the other exploits of Julian in Gaul, see *ibid.*, xvi-xxi. Conditions in Gaul are pictured by Julian himself, *Oratio ad S. P. Q. Athen.*, ed. F. C. Hertlein (Leipzig, 1875-6); and also by Libanius, *Orat.*, x; Sozomen, iii, 1; and Zosimus, iii, 3. See G. Negri, *Julian the Apostate*, trans. from Italian by Duchess Litta-Visconti-Arese (New York, 1905).

[3] Eutropius, x, 14.

[4] Ammianus, xvii, 12. Constantius, like his father, assumed the honorary appellation of *Sarmaticus*.

his brother Valens in the government, giving him special control of the eastern provinces while he himself administered the western.

Valentinian straightway visited the camps and cities which were situated near the rivers, and repaired to Gaul, then exposed to the inroads of the Alamanni, who had begun to pluck up their courage after hearing of the death of Julian. Valentinian was deservedly dreaded because he took care to reinforce his army and fortified both banks of the Rhine with lofty fortresses and castles, to prevent the enemy from ever passing unperceived into our territory. We may pass over many things he did with the authority of a fully established governor, and the reforms which he effected, either himself or through his active lieutenants. After he had raised his son Gratian to a partnership in the government,[1] he secretly (since he could not do it openly) struck down Vithigabius, the king of the Alamanni and son of Vadomarius,[2] a young man in the first bloom of youth, who was actively stirring up the tribes to tumults and arms. He also fought against the Alamanni near Solicinium, where he was nearly circumvented and slain in an ambuscade, but was at last able to destroy their whole army with the exception of a few who in the darkness saved themselves by flight. Amid all these prudent actions Valentinian also turned his attention to the Saxons who had lately broken out with extreme ferocity, making unexpected attacks in every

[1] 367. Gratian was then in his ninth year.

[2] The chieftain Vadomarius affords an excellent example of the indifference with which the Germans seem to have fought for, or against, Rome. In the first mention of him (Ammianus, xiv, 10), we find him leading incursions of Alamanni into Gaul. A few years later he is again ravaging the Roman frontier until seized by Julian's stratagem (*ibid.*, xxi, 3, 4). We next hear of him as an imperial officer sent by Valens in 365 with a body of troops to suppress the revolt of Procopius and besiege Nicaea (xxvi, 8) and again in 371 as duke of Phoenicia fighting valiantly against the Persians (xxix, 1).

direction, and had now penetrated into the inland districts, from which they were returning enriched by booty. He destroyed them utterly by a device, treacherous indeed, but advantageous; and he recovered by force all the plunder which the robbers were carrying off. He also revived the hopes of the Britons, who had not been hitherto successful against the hosts of enemies overrunning their country; and he reëstablished liberty and lasting peace among them, so that scarcely any of the invaders could even return to their own country. . . . Although these achievements, which we have here recorded, were consummated by the assistance of his admirable generals,[1] yet it is well understood that he himself also performed many exploits, being a man fertile in resources, and of long experience and great skill in military affairs; and certainly it would have shone the brighter among his deeds if he had been able to take King Macrianus alive, at that time very formidable; nevertheless he exerted great energy in attempting to do so, after he learned with sorrow and indignation that he had escaped from the Burgundians, whom he himself had led against the Alamanni.[2]

While Valentinian was engaged in checking barbarian inroads in the western provinces of the empire, his brother Valens was concerned with the Goths. A hundred years earlier Aurelian had allowed the Goths, who had been ravaging the east by land and sea, to occupy Dacia north of the

[1] Prominent among these generals was the father of the later emperor Theodosius, commonly called Count Theodosius, for whose campaigns in Britain and against the Alamanni, see Ammianus, xxviii, 3, 5.

[2] Ammianus, xxx, 7. The same authority gives detailed accounts of Valentinian's work in fortifying the Rhine (xxviii, 2), in repulsing Alamanni and Burgundians (xxvii, 10; xxx, 3), and in fighting Saxons (xxviii, 2, 5). The emperor's relations with the Alaman king, Macrianus, and the incursions of Sarmatians and Quadi are also described (xxix, 4, 6; xxx, 3, 5, 6).

Danube and thenceforth they had lived under their own chieftains in nominal subjection to the commonwealth and in comparative peace. Now the Goths had been so unfortunate as to favor a certain Procopius, an unsuccessful aspirant for the purple, and Valens resolved to punish them. "To excuse their conduct by a valid defence they produced letters from this Procopius which alleged that he had assumed the sovereignty as his due as the nearest relative of Constantine."[1] The excuse was not accepted, but after three years' intermittent campaigns (367-9) a peace was negotiated.[2] Peace for the Goths was shortlived, however, for hardly had they concluded the treaty with Valens when they were attacked by the Huns, who came from the northeast. "This latter active and indomitable race, excited by an unrestrained desire of plundering the possessions of others, went on ravaging and slaughtering all the tribes in their neighborhood until they reached the Alani . . . with whom they finally made a treaty of friendship and alliance."[3] The allies then attacked the German peoples to the west, and the Goths, filled with fear, entreated Valens to be received by him as subjects, promising to live quietly and to furnish a body of auxiliary troops if necessary. The emperor dispatched officers

to bring this ferocious people and their carts into our country. And such great pains were taken to gratify this nation which was destined to overthrow the Roman state that not one was

[1] Ammianus, xxvii, 5.

[2] Shortly after the treaty, Athanaric, a Gothic chieftain who had formerly stated "that he was bound by a most dreadful oath and by his father's commands never to set foot on Roman soil," went to Constantinople, "being driven from his native land by a faction among his kinsmen, and he died there and was buried with splendid ceremony according to our rites." Ammianus, xxvii, 5.

[3] Ammianus, xxxi, 2.

left behind, not even of those who were stricken with mortal disease. Moreover, so soon as they had obtained permission of the emperor to cross the Danube and to cultivate some districts of Thrace, they poured across the stream day and night, without ceasing, embarking in troops on board ships and rafts and on canoes made of the hollow trunks of trees.[1]

The immanence of our danger manifestly called for generals already illustrious for their past achievements in war; but nevertheless, as if some unpropitious deity had made the selection, the men who were sought out for the chief military appointments were of tainted character. The chief among them were Lupicinus and Maximus,—the one being count of Thrace, the other a leader notoriously wicked,—both men of great ignorance and rashness. Their treacherous covetousness was the cause of all our disasters, . . . for when the barbarians who had been conducted across the river were in great distress from want of provisions, those detested generals conceived the idea of a most disgraceful traffic; and having collected dogs from all quarters with the most insatiable rapacity, they exchanged them for an equal number of slaves, among whom were several sons of men of noble birth.[2]

These and like corrupt practices on the part of the government officials at length aroused the Gothic chieftain Fritigern to revolt:

The standards of war were raised according to custom and the trumpets poured forth sounds of evil omen, while predatory bands collected, plundering and burning villas and alarming everyone by their dreadful devastations. [Lupicinus, who rashly attacked them, was defeated and] the enemies, clothing themselves in Roman armor, pushed on their raid without hindrance.[3]

Here the historian pauses to refute those who affirm that

[1] Ammianus, xxxi, 4. A. D. 376.

[2] *Ibid.*, xxxi, 4.

[3] *Ibid.*

the commonwealth was never before so overwhelmed by adverse fortune and to remind them of the Teutones and Cimbri, of the incursions during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and of many other similar calamities.

While Fritigern was in revolt, certain Goths at Adrianople, who were ill-treated by the Romans, joined him, and the united forces made an ineffectual attempt to take that city by siege.[1] They turned then to ravage Thrace, being

greatly encouraged by this circumstance, that a multitude of their nation came in daily who had formerly been sold as slaves by the merchants, with many others who at the first passage of the river, when they were suffering from severe want, had been bartered for a little bad wine or a few morsels of bread. To these were added no small number of men skilled in tracing out veins of gold, but who were unable to endure the heavy burden of their taxes; and who, having been received with the cheerful consent of all, were of great use to them while traversing strange districts—showing them the secret stores of grain, the retreats of men, and other hiding-places of divers kinds. Under their guidance, nothing remained untouched except what was inaccessible or wholly out of the way; for without any distinction of age or sex they went forward destroying everything in one vast slaughter and conflagration: tearing infants even from their mother's breast and slaying them; ravishing the mothers; slaughtering women's husbands before the eyes of those whom they thus made widows; while boys of tender and of adult age were dragged over the corpses of their parents. Numbers of old men, finally, crying out that they had lived long enough, having lost all their wealth, together with beautiful women, had their hands bound behind their backs, and were driven into banishment, bewailing the ashes of their native homes.[2]

This was the motley throng against whom Valens prepared

[1] Ammianus, xxxi, 6. [2] *Ibid.*

to lead his army.[1] His lieutenants were unable to expel the Goths from Thrace in 377 and in the following year, without waiting the arrival of Gratian [2] from the west, he engaged the barbarians outside the walls of Adrianople and lost his life.

Except the battle of Cannae, no such slaughter is recorded in our annals, though even in the times of prosperity, the Romans have sometimes had to deplore the uncertainty of war, and temporary evils, while well-known dirges of the Greeks have bewailed many disastrous battles.[3]

The battle of Adrianople was not decisive, however, in immediate results, and the death of Valens does not seem to be more significant than the death of Decius over a century previously. The Goths followed up their victory but failed to take Adrianople by siege; their subsequent effort to capture Constantinople was likewise a failure.

Then having sustained greater losses than they had inflicted they roamed at random over the northern provinces, which they traversed without restraint as far as the foot of the Julian Alps, which the ancients used to call the Venetian Alps.

At this time the efficiency of Julius, Master of the Soldiery on the other side of Mount Taurus, was particularly prompt and salutary; for when he learned what had happened in Thrace, he sent secret letters to all the governors of the different cities and forts, who were all Romans—which at this time is rare,—requesting them, on one and the same day, at a concerted signal, to put to death all the Goths who had previously been admitted into the places under their charge, first luring them into the suburbs in the expectation of receiving promised pay. This wise plan was carried out without any disturbance or delay, and the eastern provinces were delivered from great dangers.[4]

[1] The events which led up to the battle of Adrianople and a vivid description of the battle itself are given by Ammianus in Book xxxi.

[2] Gratian had recently defeated the Alamanni. Ammianus, xxxi, 10.

[3] Ammianus, xxxi, 13.

[4] *Ibid.*, xxxi, 16.

CHAPTER VIII

General Character of the Germanic Invasions

Although the battle of Adrianople and the death of Valens are not epochal in the history of the relations between Romans and barbarians, they mark a distinct transition in the quality of the sources. That is probably why Gibbon, and following him, many writers of text books have seen fit to emphasize out of all proportion the events of the year 378. The sources from Julius Caesar to Ammianus, fragmentary and poor as they often are, are infinitely better than the sources for the great Germanic movements of the fifth and sixth centuries by which the western provinces were gradually to dissolve. Gibbon felt this especially in the case of Ammianus, to whom he pays the often quoted tribute:

> It is not without the most sincere regret that I must now take leave of an accurate and faithful guide, who has composed the history of his own times without indulging the prejudices and passions which usually affect the mind of a contemporary. Ammianus Marcellinus, who terminates his useful work with the defeat and death of Valens, recommends the more glorious subject of the ensuing reign to the youthful vigor and eloquence of the rising generation. The rising generation was not disposed to accept his advice or to imitate his example; and, in the study of the reign of Theodosius, we are reduced to illustrate the partial narrative of Zosimus by the obscure hints of fragments and chronicles, by the figurative style of poetry or panegyric, and by the precarious assistance of the ecclesiastical writers

who, in the heat of religious faction, are apt to despise the profane virtues of sincerity and moderation. Conscious of these disadvantages, which will continue to involve a considerable portion of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, I shall proceed with doubtful and timorous steps.[1]

The sources which treat of the Germanic movements from the time of Julius Caesar to that of Theodosius the Great consider them in the main as purely incidental. The historians are not absorbed in study of the blue-eyed, yellow-haired northerners: their prime interest is imperial achievement, civil war, home affairs; and they would no more think of giving the fateful barbarians first place in the history of the empire than an English historian would center his country's development about British military exploits on the frontier of India, or than an American writer would make the immigration of Italians and Hungarians the paramount factor in the history of the United States. Nor do these historians find it necessary to deal at length with the causes of Germanic immigration. It was the usual thing to have barbarians, German or other, living within the empire, and the causes were doubtless too familiar and too obvious to the Roman citizens to merit explanation. Modern scholars have therefore had to read between the lines in explaining the motives of the immigration. Sometimes they have read there too much. For example, it has been contended that race hatred existed between Romans and Germans; but "Roman" was hardly a racial designation and the barbarians seem to have been fully as zealous to fight one another as to engage the imperial citizens. It has likewise been contended that the main cause was excess of

[1] Bury's edition, vol. iii, p. 122. Hodgkin is more sweeping but also within the bounds of truth in his condemnation of the sources for the period of the invasions, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. ii, pp. 299-303.

population among the Germans, but sociologists have demonstrated that fecundity is not a trait of peoples in like stage of development.

The causes of the migrations were diverse and complex. Desire to improve material conditions was doubtless the chief. With this in view, warrior bands plundered the provincials, and at the same time whole tribes sought peace and plenty in the southern lands under protection of the commonwealth. No doubt the love of adventure and fondness for brigandage animated the Germanic peoples to a great extent, but there was also a glamor for the barbarians about the empire and its institutions: desire to live under them and profit by them. We are prone to make the problem of the Germanic migrations too difficult. We must remember that peoples of primitive civilization bordered on peoples who were more highly developed, who inhabited fertile lands, and who lived in comparative prosperity and peace. The result was inevitable. It was unstable life arrayed in all the forms of instability against sedentary life and settled conditions.

Armed invasion was, however, but one of the forms of Germanic immigration. To supply the great need of farm hands consequent on the decrease of rural population in the empire, many captive Germans, led back into the empire in the space of the four centuries during which Roman armies penetrated into Germany, were either made slaves outright or attached to the soil as *coloni*. Moreover, there was at all times a commerce in slaves between the provinces and Germany, by means of which many barbarians were forced to move within the empire.[1]

[1] Ammianus mentions in several passages the merchants who supplied Gaul and Thrace with German slaves (xxii, 7, 8; xxix, 4, 4; xxxi, 6, 5). Tacitus had already noted the German custom of selling

Germans entered the empire, too, to serve in the Roman army, sometimes forced [1] and sometimes of their own accord.[2] The sources often intimate that barbarian troops were disliked by the population and that the imperial government was reproached for being too favorable to these foreigners.[3] From the end of the fourth century the barbarian troops became increasingly troublesome and took active part in the chronic civil wars, but they were to be found, like the Romans themselves, fighting this or that aspirant to the imperial purple, not fighting the empire itself.

Thus the entrance of the Germans into the empire, according to the sources, was not a single event under a single form and from a single motive. It was, on the contrary, a very complex series of events, accomplished only after the lapse of several centuries. The Germans entered the empire from a variety of motives and in a multiplicity of ways. They came as pirates and ravagers; they came in warrior bands because they found pleasure in fighting; they came as immigrants and settlers; they came to take military or civil

slaves to foreigners (*Germania,* 24), and in the Life of Agricola (28) there is the case of Usipians sold by Suevi. The sources give few instances of barbarian slaves joining their invading countrymen, such as the Goths in Thrace (Ammianus, xxxi, 6, 5) and Alaric at Rome (Zosimus, v, 42).

[1] The idea of forcibly incorporating barbarians in the army was as old as the empire. See Tacitus, *Annales,* iv, 46; *Agricola,* 13, 28, 31; *Germania,* 29; *Hist.,* i, 59; iv, 18.

[2] The *Notitia Dignitatum* shows that the Roman army in the early part of the fifth century included many Germans: Heruli, Marcomanni and Alani were in barracks in Italy; Salii in Spain, Gaul and even in Africa; many of them, serving as *fœderati,* must have had permanent establishments.

[3] "The true patriot emperor will find this to be his first task, cautiously but firmly to weed out the barbarians from his army and make that army what it once was, Roman." Synesius, *Oration on Kingship.*

office within the empire; they came by force to serve the Romans; they came now singly, now in troops, now with their household and all their movable belongings; they came as friends of the state, as enemies of the state, as allies or partisans of some general or emperor; and often they came simply in quest of greater prosperity with all respect and honor for the ancient commonwealth of Rome.

How did the Romans regard this Germanic immigration? Their point of view was different from ours, for the immediate contact and the events passing daily before their eyes prevented anything like the cold analytical treatment which we employ. The Romans before engaging the Germans had contended with settled peoples. Even the Gallic populations were attached to the soil and had cities. And when the Romans found foes in unsettled Germans, they despised them and exaggerated their weakness as we exaggerate their strength. The Romans believed firmly in the eternity of Rome and the empire; they could foresee no ultimate danger to the commonwealth; they give no hint of any suspicion that the Germans would one day overturn the state and plant rival kingdoms in its stead. The emperors were glad to use Germans in the army, and the landowners found them very serviceable on the estates. As time went on, the Germans were more and more identified with the popular issues, political and religious. It was a time when the Roman world was divided between Christians and pagans, and the contest was between religions rather than races; probably each party hoped to secure the balance of power from barbarian proselytes;[1] at any rate, each party ac-

[1] Ulfilas (d. 381) had preached to the Goths while they were still living north of the Danube, and his translation of most of the Bible into Gothic, using Greek letters to represent the sounds, is the only example of writing in any German language before Charlemagne's time. The orthodox Orosius saw only the finger of God in the battle

cused the other of responsibility for the ills which existed or were imagined to exist in the commonwealth. It was a time, likewise, when rival generals contended with each other for the purple, and each contestant for political supremacy sought barbarian support. The strife of emperors eclipsed the strife of races.

It is not necessary to look to a decline of Roman organization and prowess in order to explain the ultimate success of the Germans. The Germanic immigration was so gradual, so many-sided, and so adaptive to conditions existent within the commonwealth, that not until the lapse of centuries thereafter could the true meaning and import of the transition be determined.

of Adrianople: "The Goths had previously asked through ambassadors that bishops be sent them, by whom they might learn the rule of the Christian faith. Emperor Valens sent those learned in the base and fatal Arian dogma. The Goths held to the basis of the first faith they received. Accordingly by just judgment of God did the very ones burn him on whose account they are consumed in the curse of mortal error."—vii, 33.

CHAPTER IX

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian

One hundred and fifty years elapsed from the time when Ammianus Marcellinus closed his admirable history until Procopius, another soldier-writer, narrated in similar vein the story of Justinian's wars against Vandals, Goths and Persians. The gap, remarkable for the paucity of reliable sources, is in itself an eloquent source for the magnitude of the Germanic invasions during the period. It, indeed, witnessed the wanderings of Goths through Greece and Illyricum and southern Gaul and their final settlement in Spain; it observed Vandal settlements in Africa; it beheld the bursting into Italy and Gaul of the Hunnish horde and their expulsion; it saw Angles and Saxons contending in Britain, and Franks and Burgundians living in Gaul, and more Goths — Ostrogoths — located in Italy. It was the century and the half of closest contact between Germans and Roman citizens, of gradual deliquescence of the western provinces into semi-barbarian states, and of the conversion of the immigrants to Arianism and later to Catholicism. It knew Alaric and Attila and Genseric and Odovacar and Clovis and Theodoric. But its contemporary sources of information are biased, fragmentary and dismal. They comprise the diffuse, inconsequential history of Zosimus; a very few fragments of other, and possibly better, Greek historians; Christian apologies like those of Augustine, Orosius and Salvian; ecclesiastical histories; a few meager

chronicles; biographies of wonder-working saints; and poems and panegyrics, which, unimportant in the fourth century, become invaluable in the fifth.[1] They bear witness to a decline in culture as impressive as the increasing political broils.

The chief of these disappointing sources for thirty years or more after the battle of Adrianople is Zosimus, who lived in the east, wrote in Greek and had a strong pagan bias. Of his life we know practically nothing. Photius[2] says he was *comes et exadvocatus* at Constantinople, and it has been generally assumed that he flourished about the middle of the fifth century. His history[3] consists of six books: the first contains a brief sketch of the emperors from Augustus to Diocletian (305); the second, third and fourth deal more copiously with the period from the accession of Constantius and Galerius to the death of Theodosius; and the fifth and sixth treat of the period from 395 to 409. It was probably left unfinished. The main sources for the work seem to have been Eunapius of Sardis,[4] who had continued the slender chronicle of Dexippus from 268 to 404, and the history of Olympiodorus.[5] Of the other

[1] It is interesting to note how seldom before 378 and how often afterwards Gibbon quotes panegyrists and poets.

[2] See *infra*, p. 98.

[3] There are editions of Zosimus by I. Bekker (Bonn, 1837) and by L. Mendelssohn (Leipzig, 1887). An English translation was published at London in 1814. There is a German translation by D. C. Seybold and K. C. Heyler (Frankfurt-a.-M., 1802). See C. von Hoefler, *Kritische Bemerkungen über den Zosimus und den Grad seiner Glaubwürdigkeit* (Vienna, 1880).

[4] A Greek rhetorician, born 347. His twenty-three superficial biographies of older and contemporary philosophers are our authority for Neo-Platonism in the fourth century. See K. Krumbacher, *Die Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1891).

[5] See *supra*, p. 69, note, and *infra*, p. 99.

sources we know practically nothing,[1] and it is questionable whether Zosimus was himself an eye-witness of any of the events he narrates.

Zosimus is important for the period from the death of Valens to the eve of the sack of Rome in 410; he treats, with particular attention to the eastern provinces, of the wars and character of Theodosius the Great, of Gratian and Valentinian II, of Arcadius and Honorius, of the barbarian "bosses" Gainas, Stilicho and Alaric. He tells of deeds of war, of miracles and prodigies, of princes and pillagers. The wanderings of the Goths through Greece, their temporary settlements in Illyricum and Thrace and their raids in Italy are interspersed with indications of barbarian unrest in Asia and far-off echoes of tumult in Gaul, even in Spain. Every page mentions the Germans, sometimes as slaves, more often as imperial soldiers or daring marauders, but the monotony of barbarian broils is occasionally broken by other kinds of civil war, as the rebellion of a Gildo or the usurpation of a Constantine; and our writer, if he understands the Germanic invasions a little better than his predecessors, acquaints us not with the social conditions or the political organization of the invaders.

Zosimus has a decided *tendenz*. He feels instinctively a decline in imperial fortune and he knows where to fix the blame; he is a pious pagan: he fixes it on Christianity. He seeks ever by damaging innuendo and clever sarcasm to raise a laugh at the expense of the Christians. A good example of this tendency is his account of Constantine's conversion, especially his incidental and slighting observation on the Christian method of forgiving sins:

When Constantine came to Rome, he was filled with pride and

[1] See R. C. Martin, *De fontibus Zosimi* (Berlin, 1866).

arrogance. Resolved to begin his impious actions at home, he put to death his son Crispus, who was a Caesar, on the charge of debauching his mother-in-law Fausta, without any regard to the ties of nature. And when his own mother, Helena, expressed much sorrow for this atrocity, lamenting the young man's death with great bitterness, Constantine, under pretence of comforting her, applied a remedy worse than the disease. For causing a bath to be heated to an extraordinary degree, he shut up Fausta in it, and a short time after took her out dead. His conscience troubled him for this, as also for violating his oath, and he went to the [pagan] priests to be purified from his sins. They told him, however, that no kind of lustration would suffice to clear him of such enormities. A Spaniard, named Aegyptius, who was at Rome, being very familiar with the court ladies [!], happened to engage in conversation with Constantine and assured him that the Christian doctrine would teach him how to cleanse himself from all the offences and that they who received it were immediately absolved from all their sins. Constantine had no sooner heard this than he readily believed what was told him, and forsaking the rites of his country, received those which Aegyptius offered him . . .[1]

The religious bias of Zosimus is apparent in many other places:

Theodosius the Great before his departure from Rome convened the senate, which firmly adhered to the ancient rites and customs of the country and could not be induced to join those who were inclined to contempt for the gods. In a speech he exhorted the senators to relinquish their errors, as he termed them, and to embrace the Christian faith, which promises absolution from all sins and impieties. But not a single one of them would be persuaded to this, nor recede

[1] ii, 29. This is one of the earliest references to what was later expanded into the legend of the *Vita Sylvestri*.

from the ancient ceremonies which had been handed down to them from the building of their city, and prefer to them an unreasoning assent, having, as they said, lived in the observance of them almost twelve hundred years, in the whole space of which their city had never been conquered; wherefore should they change them for others, they could not foresee what might ensue. Theodosius then told them that the treasury was too much exhausted by the expense of sacred rites and sacrifices, and that he should consequently abolish them, since he neither thought them commendable nor could the needs of the army spare so much money. The senate in reply observed that the sacrifices were not duly performed unless the charges were defrayed from the public funds. Yet the laws for the performance of sacred rites and sacrifices were repealed, besides other institutions and ceremonies which had been received from their ancestors. By these means, the Roman empire, having been devastated by degrees, is become the habitation of barbarians, or rather, having lost all its inhabitants, is reduced to such a form that no person can distinguish where its cities formerly stood.[1] . . .

[The barbarian Fraiutus] returned to the emperor [Arcadius] proud of his victory [over Gainas], which he openly and boldly ascribed to the favor of the gods whom he worshiped, for he was not ashamed even in the presence of the emperor to profess that he honored and worshiped the gods after the ancient custom of his forefathers and would not in that respect follow the vulgar people.[2] . . .

The Romans resolved to supply the deficiency [in the indemnity due Alaric] from the ornaments on the statues of the gods. Not only this, but they melted down some of the gold and silver statues, among which was that of Valor or Fortitude. This being destroyed, all that remained of Roman bravery and valor was totally extinguished according to the opinion of persons skilled in sacred rites and observances.[3] . . .

[1] iv, 59. [2] v, 21. [3] v, 41.

The tremendous influence exercised by German leaders in the military and political affairs of the later Roman empire stands out clearly in the narrative of Zosimus. Gratian, who sent an army to the assistance of Theodosius, entrusted the command to two Frankish chieftains.[1] One of these, Arbogastes by name,[2] later acquired such control over Valentinian II

> that he would speak without reserve to the emperor and condemn any measure which he thought improper. This gave great umbrage to Valentinian who ventured to oppose him on several occasions and would have done him injury if he could. . . . He sent frequent letters to Theodosius, acquainting him with the arrogant behavior of Arbogastes toward the majesty of an emperor and requesting his intervention.

The Frankish chieftain at length assassinated Valentinian at Vienne and picked out a puppet emperor in the person of the learned Eugenius, whose recognition he sought from Theodosius. But Theodosius himself held in high favor the Vandal, Stilicho,[3] who was more than a match for the Frank, and Zosimus becomes the chief source for the overthrow of the puppet Eugenius and the other steps by which Stilicho became the guardian of Honorius and the "boss" of the western provinces. In order that he might also be "boss" in the east, Stilicho, according to Zosimus, sent the German Gainas[4] with an army against his co-regent Rufinus "ostensibly to assist Arcadius." Having arrived in the east, however, Gainas used his might and consequent political influence not altogether in behalf of his barbarian patron, but rather, to control in his own interest the weak-kneed Arcadius. He made short shrift of Rufinus and of

[1] iv, 32. [2] iv, 53-59.

[3] Stilicho had married the emperor's niece. [4] v, 8-22.

another court favorite, a certain Eutropius, and might have continued to exercise an influence as paramount in the east as that of Stilicho in the west had not another German, this time a certain Fraiutus "who was a Greek to most intents and purposes even in religion," surpassed him in prowess and supplanted him in favor. Arcadius gave Fraiutus command of the army, with the unanimous consent of the senate, and appointed him consul. Zosimus, however, sheds no tear over the fate of poor Gainas, who retired from the politics and the territory of the ungrateful empire, was killed in battle with the Huns, and whose head was sent to grace Arcadius's court.[1]

Zosimus views the movements of the Goths as the result of the relations between Stilicho, who was "boss," and Alaric, who wanted the emoluments of "boss" government.[2] He states that Alaric received an imperial office in Illyricum, besides an appropriation from the senate,[3] and was promised command of the army of Honorius against the usurper Constantine while Stilicho should head the regency for the young Theodosius II.[4] He hints at vague and dark intrigues in court and in the army which brought about the death of Stilicho[5] and drove Alaric[6] to employ force in order to secure his coveted offices and honors. There are two successful sieges of Rome, the second because "the emperor declared that no office or command should ever be

[1] Two epic poems treat of the Gainas episode: one recited by Ammonius *cca.* 437; and the other the *Gainea* of Eusebius, the pupil of Troilus. For an excellent account of the political relations between these barbarian courtiers and their armies in the field, see A. Güldenpenning, *Geschichte des oströmischen Reichs unter den Kaisern Arcadius und Theodosius II* (Halle, 1885).

[2] v, 26. The estimate of Stilicho by Zosimus should be compared with Claudian's and with that of Orosius.

[3] v, 29. [4] v, 31. [5] v, 34. [6] v, 37-51; vi, 6-13.

conferred on him or any of his family."[1] Zosimus does not suggest that Alaric sought the destruction of Rome, much less the overthrow of the commonwealth; in fact, he conveys the impression that Alaric was not even pillaging Rome, as many other German chieftains had pillaged other towns of the empire, primarily for the purpose of plunder, but rather that he might be permitted to manage the politics of the state. Failing in his attempt to bring Honorius to terms, the Gothic politician determined to have an emperor whom he could control:

Alaric, finding that he could not procure a peace on the conditions which he proposed and not having received any hostages, once more threatened to attack Rome if the citizens refused to join him against emperor Honorius. They deferred their answer until he besieged the city and occupied Portus after a resistance of several days. He threatened to distribute among his men the supplies which he seized at Portus unless the Romans should accede to his demands. The senate assembled and on due deliberation complied with all that Alaric required, for it would have been impossible to avoid death inasmuch as no provisions could be brought to the city from Portus. They accordingly received the embassy of Alaric, invited him to their city, and, as he commanded, placed Attalus, the prefect of the city, on the imperial throne and gave the command to Alaric and Valens, who had formerly commanded the Dalmatian legions, distributing the other offices in proper order. Alaric then occupied the palace, attended by an imperial guard, although many ill omens occurred on his way. The following day he entered the senate and made an arrogant speech, saying with great ostentation that he would subdue the whole world to the Romans and even perform greater things than that. For this the gods perhaps were angry and decreed soon afterwards his removal. . . . None

[1] v, 49.

was displeased with these occurrences except the family of the Anicii,[1] who had got into their hands almost all the money in the city and were now grieved at the prosperous state of affairs. Alaric prudently advised Attalus to send a competent force into Africa and to Carthage . . . but Attalus would not listen to his admonitions. . . . Honorius was so terrified and perplexed that he sent out ambassadors to propose that the empire should be divided between them. . . . [Honorius prepared to flee but the arrival of aid from the east enabled him to await the outcome of the African campaign. Alaric meanwhile became more and more disgusted with Attalus.] . . .

Now Attalus went to Rome and convened the senate. After some debate, most of the senators were of the opinion that barbarians and Roman soldiers ought to be sent to Africa together, and that Drumas should be their commander, he being a person who had already given proofs of his fidelity and good will. Only Attalus and a few more dissented from the majority of the senate, he being unwilling to send out a barbarian as commander of a Roman army. This was the first time that Alaric formed a design against Attalus to depose him or deprive him of life, although Jovius had previously instigated him to it by incessant calumnies and false accusations. In order therefore to put his design in execution, he led Attalus out before the city of Rimini, where he then resided, and stripped off his diadem and purple robe, which he sent to emperor Honorius. But although he reduced Attalus to the condition of a private individual before all the people, he kept him and his son Ampelius at his own house until he had made peace with Honorius, when he procured their pardon.[2]

[1] One of the leading Christian families at Rome. See H. Grisar, *Histoire de Rome et des papes,* trans. from German (Paris, 1906), vol. i, p. 53. This passage in Zosimus is an illustration of his resourcefulness in casting discredit on those who differed from him in belief.

[2] vi, 6-12. Orosius remarks with diverting contradictions (vii, 42):

Zosimus devotes little attention to what we now suppose were momentous events west of the Alps during those early years of the fifth century. The Germanic invasions and settlements in Gaul, Britain and Spain are dismissed in a few lines:

Arcadius being in his sixth consulship and Probus his colleague, the Vandals united with the Alani and Suevi and crossed the Alps, plundering the country beyond. They occasioned so great slaughter that the armies in Britain, fearing lest they might extend their ravages into those regions, chose several usurpers, such as Marcus, Gratian, and especially Constantine.[1] A furious engagement ensued in which the Romans gained the victory and killed most of the barbarians, but neglected to pursue the fugitives, who might have been put to death to a man. This gave the barbarians an opportunity to rally, to collect additional forces, and once more to assume the offensive. Constantine posted garrisons to keep them out of Gaul and likewise secured the Rhine which had been neglected since the time of emperor Julian. . . .

"What shall I say of most wretched Attalus, whose distinction was to be slain as a usurper and whose gain was death? Alaric watched the play of empire and laughed at the farce of this emperor made, unmade, remade, and demade, almost in less time than it takes to tell; nor is it to be wondered at that the unhappy man was rightfully deceived by the same kind of pomp with which that retired consul Tertullus ventured to say in court, 'I shall address you, conscript fathers, as consul and pontifex, the one of which I am, the other I hope to be,' since he was deriving hope from him who had no hope, and was accursed besides because he put his confidence in man. Thus did Attalus with the Goths carry the lifeless form of empire as far as Spain. He departed thence in an unseaworthy vessel, was captured at sea and brought before count Constantius; then he was exhibited by emperor Honorius and suffered the loss of a hand though his life was spared."

[1] This is the usurper Constantine who was proclaimed emperor in Britain in 407 but was forced to abdicate at Arles in 411.

While the greater part of Constantine's army was in Spain, the barbarians from beyond the Rhine made such unrestrained incursions into every province as to compel not only the Britons but also some of the Celtic tribes to secede from the empire, and live no longer under Roman law but as they themselves pleased. Thus the Britons took up arms and encountered many dangers for their own protection, until they had freed their towns of the barbarians who besieged them. Similarly, the whole of Armorica, together with other Gallic provinces, was delivered, expelling the Roman officers and magistrates and erecting whatever government was required. In this way, Britain and the Celtic tribes revolted when Constantine usurped the empire, by whose negligent government the barbarians were emboldened to commit such devastation.[1]

It is possible that the fifth century possessed better historians than Zosimus, but if so, their works have perished. We know next to nothing about a certain Sulpicius Alexander, who, as well as Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, is mentioned by Gregory of Tours, or about Ablavius, whose history of the Goths is cited by Jordanes. Then too, the few fragments of the Greek historians of the fifth century which have survived,[2] are too meager to enable us to pass a decisive opinion on their relative merit and authority. What we have of them is due largely to two Greek scholars of later centuries, the patriarch Photius (d. 891) and the emperor Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus (d. 959).

Photius prepared for his brother, who was absent in the east, brief critical analyses of the books which had been read and discussed in the literary circle at Constantinople, of which

[1] vi, 3-6.

[2] These Greek fragments, with a rather unreliable Latin translation, are collected in C. Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iv.

he was a prominent figure.[1] In this fashion, outlines of some two hundred and eighty works, with valuable extracts, were preserved. Among the number are the chronicle of Eunapius of Sardis which dealt particularly with the period immediately following the death of Theodosius the Great; the history of Olympiodorus extending from 407 to 425; the work of Malchus, a native of Philadelphia in Syria, which covered the period from 474 to 480;[2] and the account of the reigns of Leo I and Zeno (457-491) by Candidus, who was "secretary to influential Isaurians."

As for the erudite emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, he directed the compilation of a great source-book, the material for which was grouped under fifty-three headings. Much of this is now lost, but the two extant sections on state missions and embassies have saved for us some important details, which inject a little life into the few dull chronicles[3] that are our main guides to events from the point where Zosimus deserts us (409) down to the establishment of Theodoric's power in Italy (*cca.* 490).

The best written and most helpful of all these fragments[4] are the excerpts from the account of Priscus of the mission which he undertook for Theodosius II in 448 to the court

[1] The *Bibliotheca* of Photius is edited by Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, vols. ci-civ. See J. Card. Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel, sein Leben, seine Schriften, und das griechische Schisma* (Regensburg, 1867). Most of the Greek historians of the empire are to be found in two collections: that of Bonn, *Corpus historiae Byzantinae*, commenced by Niebuhr in 1826 and continued by Bekker, and that of C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.*

[2] Suidas, the Greek lexicographer who flourished in the latter part of the tenth century, asserts that the history of Malchus extended from the time of Constantine the Great to that of Anastasius.

[3] See *infra*, p. 145 *et seq.*

[4] For a useful guide to these and other Greek sources, see K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1891).

of the Huns. The account is enriched by digressions on the life of Attila and the customs of his people. Priscus appears to have had the qualities of fairness and keen observation. It is regrettable that we have not more information like the following:

A man whom, from his Scythian dress, I took for a barbarian, came up [while I was waiting for the audience with Attila] and addressed me in Greek, with the word "Hail!" I was surprised at a Scythian speaking Greek. For the subjects of the Huns, swept together from various lands, speak beside their own barbarous tongue, either Hunnic or Gothic, or—as many as have commercial dealing with the western Romans—Latin; but none of them speak Greek readily, except captives from the Thracian or Illyrian seacoast; and these last are easily known to any stranger by their torn garments and the squalor of their head, as men who have met with a reverse. This man, on the contrary, resembled a well-to-do Scythian, being well dressed, and having his hair cut in a circle after Scythian fashion.

Having returned his salutation, I asked him who he was and whence he had come into a foreign land and adopted Scythian life. When he asked me why I wanted to know, I told him that his Hellenic speech had prompted my curiosity. Then he smiled and said that he was born a Greek and had gone as a merchant to Viminacium, on the Danube, where he had stayed a long time, and married a very rich wife. But the city fell a prey to the barbarians, and he was stripped of his prosperity, and on account of his riches was allotted to Onegesius [a Hunnish leader] in the division of the spoil, as it was the custom among the Scythians for the chiefs to reserve for themselves the rich prisoners. Having fought bravely against the Romans and the Acatiri, he had paid the spoils he won to his master, and so obtained freedom. He then married a barbarian wife and had children, and had the privilege of partaking at the table of Onegesius.

He considered his new life among the Scythians better than

his old life among the Romans, and the reasons he urged were as follows: "After war the Scythians live at leisure, enjoying what they have got, and not at all, or very little, disturbed. The Romans, on the other hand, are in the first place very liable to be killed, if there are any hostilities, since they have to rest their hopes of protection on others, and are not allowed, by their tyrants, to use arms. And those who do use them are injured by the cowardice of their generals, who cannot properly conduct war.

"But the condition of Roman subjects in time of peace is far more grievous than the evils of war, for the exaction of the taxes is very severe, and unprincipled men inflict injuries on others because the laws are practically not valid against all classes. A transgressor who belongs to the wealthy classes is not punished for his injustice, while a poor man, who does not understand business, undergoes the legal penalty,—that is, if he does not depart this life before the trial, so long is the course of lawsuits protracted, and so much money is expended on them. The climax of misery is to have to pay in order to obtain justice. For no one will give a hearing to the injured man except he pay a sum of money to the judge and the judge's clerks."

In reply to this attack on the empire, I asked him to be good enough to listen with patience to the other side of the question. "The creators of the Roman republic," I said, "who were wise and good men, in order to prevent things from being done at haphazard, made one class of men guardians of the laws, and appointed another class to the profession of arms, who were to have no other object than to be always ready for battle, and to go forth to war without dread, as though to their ordinary exercise, having by practice exhausted all their fear beforehand. Others again were assigned to attend to the cultivation of the ground, to support themselves and those who fight in their defence by contributing the military corn supply. . . . To those who protect the interests of the litigants a sum of money is paid by the latter,

just as a payment is made by the farmers to the soldiers. Is it not fair to support him who assists and requite him for his kindness? . . .

"Those who spend money on a suit and lose it in the end cannot fairly put it down to anything but the injustice of their case. And as to the long time spent on lawsuits, that is due to anxiety for justice, that judges may not fail in passing judgments by having to give sentence offhand; it is better that they should reflect, and conclude the case more tardily, than that by judging in a hurry they should both injure the man and transgress against the Deity, the institutor of justice. . . .

"The Romans treat their slaves better than the king of the Scythians treats his subjects. They deal with them as fathers or teachers, admonishing them to abstain from evil or follow the lines of conduct which they have esteemed honorable; they reprove them for their errors like their own children. They are not allowed, like the Scythians, to inflict death on their slaves. They have numerous ways of conferring freedom; they can manumit not only during life, but also by their wills, and the testamentary wishes of a Roman in regard to his property are law."

My interlocutor shed tears, and confessed that the laws and constitution of the Romans were fair, but deplored that the officials, not possessing the spirit of former generations, were ruining the state.[1]

Another interesting fragment is the account which Malchus gives of the embassy that Odovacar, the German "boss," dispatched to Constantinople after little Romulus Augustulus had been sent away to a château in the country (476). It is important for the relations between the German "boss" and Emperor Zeno, and also the emperor, Nepos, who had been previously driven out of Rome; and,

[1] From J. B. Bury, *Later Roman Empire* (London, 1889), vol. i, pp. 218-219.

in order to illustrate further the style of these excerpts relating to embassies, it is here inserted:

Odovacar compelled the senate to dispatch an embassy to Emperor Zeno to inform him that they no longer needed an emperor of their own; a common emperor would be sufficient who alone should be supreme ruler of both boundaries [of the empire]; that they had, moreover, chosen Odovacar to guard their interests, since he had an understanding of both political and military affairs. They therefore begged Zeno to honor him with the title of patrician and to commit to him the diocese of the Italians. The men from the Roman senate arrived bringing this message to Byzantium.

During these days there came also messengers from Nepos, who were to congratulate Zeno on what had taken place [namely, the overthrow of the usurper Basiliscus] and ask him at the same time zealously to aid Nepos, who had been suffering in the same way as he, to regain his power by supplying money and an army and all things necessary to effect his restoration. Those who were to say these things were accordingly dispatched by Nepos.

But Zeno made the following reply to the men from the senate, namely, that of the two emperors they had received from the east, one they had driven out, while Anthemius they had killed. What should be done under the circumstances they must surely perceive. So long as an emperor still lived, there was no other policy possible except that they should receive him when he returned.

To the men from the barbarian [i. e. Odovacar] he replied that it would be wise for Odovacar to accept the dignity of patrician from Emperor Nepos; and that he himself would send it, should Nepos not anticipate him; and he praised Odovacar because he had shown a tendency to preserve the order established by the Romans, and trusted therefore that Odovacar, if he wished to do the fair thing, would receive the emperor who had paid him these honors. And sending a royal letter to Odovacar, expressing his wishes, he addressed him as patrician.

CHAPTER X

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): The Ecclesiastical Historians

Zosimus was distinctly inferior to several of his predecessors as an historical writer, and the Greek fragments which reinforce and continue his work are vague and desultory. The decline in quantity and quality of sources was contemporaneous with a generally admitted weakening of government, at least in the western provinces. Conditions within the commonwealth were manifestly growing worse; there was less order and more bloodshed, increasing robbery and decreasing security. The "good old days" lay behind, not ahead. The decline was also attended by the rise of a new religion, which was obviously growing in numbers and influence at the expense of the old state religion. The pagans very naturally connected the two ideas and ascribed to Christianity the cause of imperial weakness. Such a charge threatened serious danger to the new faith, and the Christian apologists, who were developing a new kind of historical philosophy, looked about for a final convincing answer.

The taunts of Zosimus, or of people like him, on the sack of Rome by Alaric and the Goths, were a leading factor in inciting no less a man than Saint Augustine[1] to write his celebrated *City of God* to show that that disaster could not

[1] Born in 354 and became bishop of Hippo in 395. He died in 430, while his city was besieged by the Vandals.

be reasonably attributed to the anger of the heathen gods who had been deserted for the God of the Christians:

. . . Wherefore, touching the temporal city (which longing after domination, though it hold all the other nations under it, yet in itself is overruled by the one lust after sovereignty) we may not omit to speak whatsoever the quality of our proposed subject shall require or permit, for out of this arise the foes against whom God's city is to be guarded. Yet some of these reclaiming their impious errors have become good citizens therein; but others burning with an extreme violence of hate against it, are so thankless to the Redeemer of it for so manifest benefits of His, that at this day they would not speak a word against it, but that in the holy places thereof, flying thither from the sword of the foe, they found that life and safety wherein they now glory. Are not these Romans become persecutors of Christ, whom the very barbarians saved for Christ's sake? Yes, the churches of the Apostles and the Martyrs can testify this, which in that great sack were free both to their own and to strangers. Even thither came the rage of the bloody enemy; even there the murderer's fury stopped; even thither were the distressed led by their pitiful foes (who had spared them, though finding them out of those sanctuaries) lest they should light upon some that should not extend the like pity. And even they that elsewhere raged in slaughters, coming but to those places, that forbade what law of war elsewhere allowed, all their headlong fury curbed itself, and all their desire of conquest was conquered. And so escaped many then, that since have detracted all they can from Christianity: they can impute their city's other calamities wholly unto Christ, but that good which was bestowed on them only for Christ's honor —namely, the sparing of their lives—that they impute not unto our Christ, but unto their own fate; whereas if they had any judgment, they would rather attribute these calamities and miseries of mortality, all unto the providence of God, which useth to reform the corruptions of men's manners, by war and oppressions, and laudably to exercise the righteous in such

afflictions, and having so tried them, either to transport them to a more excellent estate or to keep them longer in the world for other ends and uses. . . .[1]

The learned bishop of Hippo, finding that he would not have time himself to review the salient points in profane and sacred history with a view to the proper illustration of his elaborate contrast of Christian society and of heathendom, entrusted that part of the apology to his friend and pupil, Orosius. That introduced on a large scale a new kind of historical source, which was greatly to influence the fifth and subsequent centuries.

Orosius had studied in northern Africa, had seen Saint Jerome in Palestine, and when he wrote his history (*cca.* 417) was a priest in Spain. He adopted with enthusiasm the curious Christian theory of the historical development of Rome from Adam through a long line of Hebrew judges, kings, and prophets, and not inappropriately labeled his work "Seven Books of Histories against the Pagans."[2] Several Christian writers before him, notably Sextus Julius Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome, had made the connection and prepared the chronology.[3] Jerome's work was at any rate available to Orosius. Of the pagan writers, Orosius made use chiefly of Justin and somewhat of Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Eutropius, and others, although it is questionable whether he quoted all his authorities directly or merely copied quotations from some one else's work.

[1] *De civitate Dei*, i, 1.

[2] The best edition of Orosius is that by C. Zangemeister (Vienna, 1882). The work, which was extremely popular in the middle ages, was rewritten in Anglo-Saxon by order of Alfred the Great. There is an English translation of Alfred's version by H. Sweet (London, 1883).

[3] See *infra*, p. 146.

Orosius wrote his "books of histories" to demonstrate that evils and calamities were no novelty in the world, and that the God of the Christians was in fact not so unkind as the gods of the pagans.[1] This thesis dominates the selection and presentation of all the facts and thus destroys, or at least fatally weakens, what we would nowadays term fair historical accuracy. Only the last few pages of the seventh book, which closes with the year 417, have any value for our purposes, for they relate to the writer's own time, about which, especially in Gaul and Spain, little is known. Orosius was on the ground; he witnessed barbarians everywhere about him; he saw them settling permanently in the western provinces and must have known a good deal about their organization and society, how they fused with the Roman citizens and what was the effect of Germanic invasions on Roman institutions and customs. These things, however, hardly concerned his thesis, and he left them therefore to be guessed by modern scholars. Even his remarks on military events and on the Gothic kings are almost invariably vague and desultory and end in obscurantism or pious ejaculation. The ineffable judgment of God infinitely outweighs in his eyes the specific conduct of Vandals, Goths and Roman citizens.

But with respect to the barbarians Orosius answered the pagans to his own satisfaction, and the contradictions in the reply were not allowed to impair its finality. In the first place, it was the will of God that had brought the Germans into the empire to be converted to Christianity; in the

[1] Something of the same kind is to be found in the *De mortibus persecutorum,* usually ascribed to Lactantius (d. *cca.* 340), a Greek rhetorician of Nicomedia in Bithynia and tutor to Constantine's son. The treatise endeavors to show what violent and awful deaths overtook all persecutors of Christians. Best edition by G. Laubmann and S. Brandt (Vienna, 1893). An English translation by W. Fletcher in *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* vol. vii (New York, 1896).

second place, it was the vengeance of God that had visited on the inhabitants of the empire the horrors of barbarian war, just punishment for sin; and finally, the injuries suffered at the hands of the Germans were not very great anyway, quite insignificant compared with the calamities which had befallen pagan Rome:

Now the care and instruction of the two young princes [Arcadius and Honorius] had been entrusted by the emperor Theodosius I to very capable men, to Rufinus in the east and to Stilicho in the west. What each did or aimed to do, the outcome proved, for one affected the royal dignity for himself and the other for his son, so that in the suddenly disturbed conditions their criminal ambition concealed the real needs of the commonwealth. Rufinus received barbarian peoples and Stilicho favored them. I am silent how king Alaric with his Goths was often conquered, often surrounded, but always allowed to escape. I am silent concerning those wretched doings at Pollenzo when the chief command was given to that barbarian and pagan duke Saul, by whose depravity the holiest days and sacred Easter even were profaned,[1] and an enemy yielding for the sake of religion was made to fight, with the result that, God showing in rapid judgment both what His favor avails and what His vengeance requires, we conquered fighting but in our victory were vanquished. I am silent concerning the numerous destructive feuds among the barbarians themselves, how two parties of the Goths opposed each other and how also the numbers of Alani and Goths were decreased by all sorts of slaughter.

Radagaisus, by far the most savage of all ancient and present-day enemies, by sudden attack inundated the whole of Italy. They say there were more than two hundred thousand Goths among his people. Besides leading this incredible multitude and displaying indomitable bravery, he was a pagan and a Scythian, who, in accordance with the custom of those

[1] April, 402.

barbarous tribes, vowed to drink to his gods all the blood of the Roman race. On his threatening the fortifications of Rome, all the pagans in the city met together, saying that the enemy was strong not only in his human forces but most of all in the aid of the gods, and that the city on the other hand was destitute and would soon perish because it had abandoned the gods and pagan rites. They raised great complaints everywhere and discussed the immediate revival and celebration of those rites: blasphemy raged throughout the city, and the name of Christ was publicly assailed like any pestilence of modern times. And since in a people, part good and part bad, grace was due the pious and punishment the impious, the ineffable judgment of God ordained on the one hand that enemies should assail the obstinate and refractory city with scourges more than usually severe, and on the other hand that those should not be tolerated who in excessive slaughter destroyed all without distinction.

Two Gothic peoples were then raging throughout the Roman provinces under their two powerful kings, of whom one was a Christian and more like a Roman and mild in slaughter through fear of God, as the event proved, while the other was a pagan barbarian and a Scythian in the bargain, who in his insatiable cruelty loved fame and plunder less than slaughter. The latter was now received in the lap of Italy and terrified Rome still trembling from the last danger. If power of revenge had been granted him [Radagaisus], whom the Romans thought was to be especially feared because he invoked the favor of the gods by offering sacrifices, and if greater slaughter had broken forth without consequent reformation, and error had anew grown worse than formerly, then since they had fallen into the hands of a pagan and idolater, the remaining pagans would have been persuaded to restore the worship of idols, and they would have perilously confused the Christians. The latter would have been frightened and the former confirmed by such a lesson. Wherefore God, the just director of the human race, willed that the pagan enemy

should perish and suffered the Christian to prevail, so that the Roman pagans and blasphemers might be confounded by the destruction of the one and punished by the admission of the other, especially since the admirable royal restraint and most holy faith of emperor Honorius merited not less divine compassion.

The minds and armies of other enemies are turned to aid against this most horrible Radagaisus. Uldin and Sarus, leaders of Huns and Goths, assist the Romans, but God does not permit the bravery of men, especially of enemies, to seem the cause of His power. The divine Will forces the terrified Radagaisus into the mountains of Faesulae and cuts off (to state the minimum estimate) two hundred thousand men, in need of counsel and provision and hard pressed by fear, on the rough and arid mountain ridge, and drives the lines for whom Italy had seemed too narrow, now anxious for concealment, to one small peak. Why should I tarry with elaborate details? A line of battle was not stationed; the fury and uncertain fear of a fight did not prevail; there was no slaughter; blood was not shed; and finally—what is usually distributed under fortunate circumstances—the spoils of battle were not weighed after the victory: ours ate, drank, and played, in direct proportion as the savage enemies were destroyed by hunger, thirst, and inactivity. These things are not enough unless the Romans know that the one whom they fear is captured and imprisoned, and unless they despise that idolater himself, whose sacrifices they feigned to fear more than his arms, now overcome without an engagement and a prisoner in chains. Accordingly king Radagaisus, placing his only hope in flight, secretly deserted his followers and fell among ours. He was captured and after being held in custody a little while was put to death.

There is said to have been so great a multitude of Gothic captives, moreover, that they were sold in droves for single gold pieces like the meanest cattle. God, however, permitted nothing to remain of this people, for all died who were pur-

chased and the dishonest buyers mercifully spent for burials what they had disgracefully saved in purchase prices. And just as ungrateful Rome now feels the indirect mercy of God's judgment not merely in decreasing but in suppressing presumptuous idolatry, so on account of the pious remembrance of the saints, living and dead, will she not always suffer the full wrath of God, if perchance she repents her disorders and learns faith by experience. Wherefore is she now troubled a little while by the incursion of king Alaric, an enemy but a Christian.[1]

Orosius is very hostile to Stilicho, "who was sprung from the unwarlike, covetous, perfidious and grievous race of Vandals,"[2] and accuses him of a desire to "substitute his son for his cousin" in imperial power.[3] "For this reason he spared Alaric and the whole Gothic people, who were begging simply and sincerely for a favorable peace and any possible settlements, and in order to tread down and terrify the commonwealth, he secretly favored them with an alliance while publicly refusing supplies for peace or war." It was for the same reason that he invited various tribes into Gaul and Spain and incited them to arms. That was why "Stilicho was killed by the army."[4]

Orosius gives the following account of Alaric's raid on Rome in 410, which many later writers have made of epochal importance:

Alaric it is who besieges, alarms and finally sacks anxious Rome, only after giving commands, however, that refugees in

[1] vii, 37.

[2] Saint Jerome (*Ep. ad Gerontiam*) calls Stilicho a "semi-barbarian." *Cf.* the praises of Claudian, *infra,* p. 138.

[3] Stilicho had married Serena, the cousin of Honorius. Serena was the daughter of the elder Honorius and a niece of Theodosius the Great.

[4] vii, 38.

the holy places and especially in the basilica of the holy apostles Peter and Paul are to be left quite secure and inviolate, and further that those who desire to pillage shall refrain as far as possible from bloodshed. It also befell (which proves that this sack of the city was caused by the wrath of God rather than by the enemy's bravery) that blessed Innocent, bishop of the Roman city, who had departed like virtuous Lot from Sodom by God's hidden providence and was then at Ravenna, did not behold the destruction of the sinful people.

While the barbarians were scurrying through the city, by chance one of the Goths, of powerful physique and a Christian withal, found in a certain church house a consecrated virgin well along in years, of whom he respectfully demanded gold and silver. She replied with confidence that there was much in her house and that she would fetch it at once. She did fetch it, and when on uncovering the articles she perceived the amazement of the barbarian at the size, weight, and beauty, as well as at the unknown nature of the utensils, the maid of Christ said to him: "These are the sacred vessels of the apostle Peter. Presume if thou darest; thou shalt have the deed on thy conscience. For my part, what I am unable to defend I dare not keep." The barbarian, struck with reverential awe by the fear of God and the maid's faith, reported the matter by messenger to Alaric, who ordered all the vessels to be promptly returned just as they were to the basilica of the Apostle, and the virgin together with all Christians who might join her to be conducted under the same escort. Her house, they say, was a long distance from the holy places and from the center of the city. The gold and silver vessels are thereupon distributed in regular order in full view of everyone and are carried aloft on the people's heads; the pious procession is protected on all sides by drawn swords, and a hymn is publicly intoned to God by mingled Romans and barbarians and in the midst of the city's destruction the trumpet of salvation resounds far and wide, inviting and drawing forth everyone from concealment to accompany as vessels of

Christ these vessels of Peter. To them are added many pagans who escape until the time when they are to be worse confounded. The more numerous the Roman refugees collect, the more eagerly do they surround the barbarian guards. O holy and ineffable discernment of divine judgment! O that holy and salutary stream, which taking its rise from the little house and flowing in its blessed channel to the seats of the saints, carried imperiled and weary souls in irresistible piety on its waves of safety! O that admirable trumpet of the Christian army, which, inviting in sweetest tone all without distinction to life, aroused not the disobedient to salvation and left the inexcusable to death! This wonderful event of transporting vessels, chanting hymns, and popular procession, was methinks like a great sieve, through the openings of which the live kernels from the aggregate of the Roman people as from a large quantity of grain, shaken by chance or truth, issued forth from their hiding places throughout the whole extent of the city. All their faith in present safety was derived from the storehouse of the Lord's disposals, and the rest of the people were left by their incredulity or premeditated disobedience, like dung or chaff, to be destroyed and burned. Who can weigh these complete miracles with deliberation; who can declare them with worthy praise?

The barbarians left the city of their own accord on the third day after their entrance. There was of course considerable burning of buildings, but less indeed than happened by accident 700 A. U. C.,[1] and if I review the conflagration set by emperor Nero for spectacular purposes, there will doubtless be no comparison between that which a mad prince incited and this which a conqueror's wrath inflicted. Nor need I for like purposes of comparison call to mind the Gauls who for almost a year were masters of the ashes of the burned and desolate city. And lest anyone might doubt perchance whether the enemy were suffered in order to correct the pride, licentiousness, and blasphemy of the city, it happened at the same

[1] After the funeral of Clodius, 52 B. C.

time that the most famous places in the city which escaped burning by the enemy were destroyed by lightning.

Thus in 1164 A. U. C., the city was sacked by Alaric. Although this event is of recent occurrence, nevertheless if you should see and hear the crowd of people at Rome, you would think, as they themselves declare, that nothing had happened, unless you should chance to be shown the ruins of the fire, which are still standing. Placidia, the daughter of emperor Theodosius and sister of emperors Arcadius and Honorius, was captured in this raid by Ataulf, Alaric's kinsman, and taken to wife, just as if Rome by a kind of divine judgment had delivered her as a special pledge and hostage; and she was thus joined to the most powerful relative of the barbarian king and one who was very friendly to the commonwealth.[1]

The writer makes passing mention of several tyrants or usurpers during the reign of Honorius and blames them for most of the barbarian broils. It was one of these, Constantine, who sent into Spain "those barbarians who had previously been received as *foederati*[2] and were now enrolled in the army and called *Honoriaci*," who, "being inspired by booty and allured by plenty, abandoned the defenses of the Pyrenees and admitted through the open passes into the Spanish provinces all those tribes who were ravaging Gaul and who now united with themselves." Precisely what happened is obscured in these words:

Spain is invaded; slaughter and devastation are endured; yet what is borne at the hands of the barbarians during these two years while the hostile sword is unsheathed presents nothing new as compared to what the Romans have suffered for two hundred years, or even to the destruction wrought by Germans

[1] vii, 39, 40.

[2] By Theodosius. Zosimus (iv, 40) and Jordanes (20) mention the Gothic *foederati*. The earliest extant application of the term to the Goths is in the Theodosian Code, vii, 13, 16 (A. D. 406).

for upwards of twelve years under emperor Gallienus. What man, moreover, who fears God's judgments on his thoughts and deeds or on those of his household, will not acknowledge that he justly suffers every ill and that he is even now sustaining little punishment? Or how does he who knows not self or fears not God, bear this small punishment unjustly? Wherefore, God's mercy brought this to pass with the same goodness with which it had been prophesied, so that in accordance with his enduring admonition in the gospel: "When they shall persecute you in one city, flee into another," [1] whoever wished to enter or leave could employ barbarian mercenaries, servants, and guards. The latter offered their services, moreover; and those who were able to take away everything after the general destruction demanded a small fee in payment for their service and the burden of conveyance. This was obtained by many. On the other hand, those stubborn ones who believed not the gospel of God, being doubly stubborn if they would not hear, and who would not surrender a place condemned by God's wrath, were justly overtaken and oppressed by an unexpected wrath.

The detestable barbarians are now, however, continually converting their swords into ploughshares and favoring the remaining Romans as real friends and allies, so that among them are to be found even Romans who prefer to endure poor liberty among barbarians than tributary anxiety among the Romans. If the barbarians are admitted to Roman territory for this reason alone that the churches of Christ in east and west may be filled with Huns, Suevi, Vandals, Burgundians, and countless nations of believers, God's mercy must obviously be praised and extolled, because in spite of material injury to ourselves, so many tribes receive a knowledge of the truth which they could learn by no other means. For what punishment is it to the Christian who longs for eternal life to be taken out of this world at any time or in any way? And what gain is it, moreover, to the pagan who in the midst

[1] Matth. x, 23.

of Christians is obdurate against the faith to prolong his days a little if finally on his deathbed his conversion be still despaired of?

And although the judgments of God are ineffable, and we are unable to know them all or to account for what we do know, I would briefly venture the suggestion that, by the working out of the same law, both those who know and those who do not know, incur with justice the correction of God's judgment.[1]

Orosius lauds the achievements of count Constantius in destroying the whole catalogue of open usurpers and rebellious dukes, for by his efforts and the initiative of pious Honorius "peace and unity have been restored to the Catholic Church throughout Africa . . . and the body of Christ, which we are, is healed of destructive schism."[2]

In 1168 A. U. C.[3] count Constantius established himself at Arles, a city of Gaul, and with great activity in the conduct of affairs, expelled the Goths from Narbonne[4] and forced them to withdraw into Spain, the passage of ships and traders being wholly forbidden and stopped. King Ataulf then ruled the Gothic peoples.[5] He had married Placidia, the emperor's sister, who was captured, as I have said, and succeeded Alaric in the kingdom after the sack of the city and the death of Alaric. He was an eager partisan of peace, as was often rumored and eventually demonstrated, who chose to fight loyally in behalf of emperor Honorius and to spend the strength of the Goths in defence of the Roman commonwealth.

When I was at Bethlehem, a town of Palestine, I heard a citizen of Narbonne, who had served with distinction under Theodosius, and who was besides a wise and religious person, tell most blessed Jerome, the priest, that he had been on very familiar terms with Ataulf at Narbonne and had frequently

[1] vii, 41. [2] vii, 42. [3] A. D. 414.
[4] The province of that name. [5] A. D. 410-415.

heard him affirm that, in the first exuberance of his strength and spirits, he had ardently desired to obliterate the Roman name and make the Roman empire entirely and solely Gothic: in fact, to use vulgar speech, to turn "Romania" into "Gothia,"[1] and to make himself, Ataulf, all that Caesar Augustus had once been. But when he had learned by long experience that the Goths would obey no laws on account of their unrestrained barbarism, yet that it was wrong to deprive the commonwealth of laws, without which the commonwealth is not the commonwealth, he at least for his part had chosen to have the glory of restoring entire and of magnifying the Roman name by Gothic vigor, and he wished to be looked upon by posterity as the author of the Roman restoration, since he could not be its transformer. Wherefore, being especially influenced in every good provision by the advice and counsel of his wife, Placidia, a woman of very acute judgment and sincere piety, he strove to refrain from war and to stand open to peace. And when he persisted most earnestly in seeking and granting peace, he was slain at Barcelona by treachery, they say, of his own people.

After him, Segericus was made king of the Goths, and would likewise have been, by God's judgment, favorably inclined to peace, but he was killed by his people.

Then Vallia succeeded to the kingdom. He was chosen by the Goths to break the peace, but he was ordained by God to confirm peace. He was severely frightened by God's judgment, because in a former year a Gothic expedition, well-equipped with arms and ships, in trying to cross to Africa had been overtaken by a storm within twelve miles of the strait of Gibraltar, and perished wretchedly; and also because he still remembered the fleet which had been prepared under

[1] These colloquialisms are suggestive. See Bury's edition of Gibbon, vol. i, p. 148, note. The word "Romania" seems to have been put chiefly in the mouths of persons without the empire, or used by writers when they are looking at the empire from an enemy's point of view.

Alaric's direction, and how the Goths had attempted to cross to Sicily, but had been shipwrecked in full view of their own people and drowned. Wherefore he gave most excellent hostages and concluded a highly favorable peace with emperor Honorius; he moreover returned the emperor's sister, Placidia, whom he honorably and sincerely esteemed. His own danger he sacrificed to Roman security, inasmuch as he himself fought against the other tribes who were settled throughout Spain, and conquered them for the Romans.

On their side, the kings of the Alani, Vandals, and Suevi, might, with pleasure to us, be represented as bidding emperor Honorius, "Keep peace with all of us and accept hostages from all; we fight and destroy one another; we conquer to your advantage and to that of your eternal commonwealth if we destroy each other." Who could believe this if he did not see it? Thus we hear now every day frequent and reliable news in Spain of conflicts and defeats sustained by this or that barbarian tribe, and especially of the maintenance of peace by Vallia, king of the Goths. If history shows anything of like felicity from the creation of the world up to the present time, I would concede that Christian times are really reprehensible . . . [1]

Orosius concludes his history at this point with a restatement of his thesis and a reverent tribute to Saint Augustine.

A very few facts about the Germanic invasions which might otherwise have escaped us are supplied by the more formal and perhaps more reliable Greek and Latin historians of the Christian Church. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote an Ecclesiastical History in ten books, extending from the origin of Christianity to A. D. 324. The guiding idea of Eusebius in this work, as in his Panegyric on Constantine

[1] vii, 43.

and his Life of Constantine, was the establishment of a Christian empire, for which Constantine was the chosen instrument. The Ecclesiastical History was translated from Greek into Latin by Rufinus, a priest at Aquileia in the late fourth century, who made alterations and added a supplement in two books extending to the death of Theodosius the Great (395).[1] Three independent Greek continuators of Eusebius—Sozomen,[2] Socrates,[3] and Theodoret[4]—covered the first third of the fifth century. Extracts from these histories were selected and translated from Greek into Latin by Epiphanius and edited by Cassiodorus, the prime minister of king Theodoric. The compilation was called

[1] The history of Eusebius is edited by G. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1871) and by F. A. Heinichen (Leipzig, 1868-70). The version of Rufinus is in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, vol. xxi, pp. 461-540. There is an English translation with excellent notes by A. C. McGiffert in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. i (New York, 1890). The writings of Rufinus are translated by W. H. Fremantle in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. iii (New York, 1892).

[2] Hermias Sozomenus Salaminius (d. *cca.* 450 at Constantinople). His history, covering the years 323 to 439, is in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, vol. xxv, and has been separately edited by R. Hussey, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1859-60). English translation by C. D. Hartranft in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. ii (New York, 1890). See J. Rosenstein, "Kritische Untersuchungen über d. Verhältniss zwischen Olympiodor, Zosimus u. Sozomenus" in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, vol. i, pp. 167-204.

[3] The work of Socrates, embracing the years 306 to 439, is in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, vol. xxv, and is also edited by R. Hussey, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1853). English translation by A. C. Zenos in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. ii (New York, 1890).

[4] Theodoretus, bishop of Cyrrhus in Syria (d. 457), deals with the period 325-427. Edited by Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, vols. lxxx-lxxxiv. English translation by B. Jackson in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. iii (New York, 1892). See A. Güldenpenning, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos, eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen* (Halle, 1889).

the *Historia tripartita*, and was widely used throughout the middle age as the leading manual of ecclesiastical history. Full of contradictions and often incoherent, poorly arranged in slavishly chronological order, it has small value for our purposes. All these ecclesiastical histories devote slightly less attention to miracles and monks than do the apologies and saints' lives, but their exhaustive treatment of the heresies of the age leaves little space for political or social record.

In the same class belongs the *Historia sacra*[1] of Sulpicius Severus (d. *cca.* 410), a native of Aquitaine. It is divided into two books, the first extending from the creation of the world to the Babylonian captivity of the Jews, and the second to A. D. 397. It is the earliest sacred history written in Latin, and from the standpoint of language and style is an excellent piece of work: it indicates that ancient culture still influenced men in Gaul. Sulpicius Severus never mentions his non-biblical authorities. He neither intended nor furnished a scientific history, but compiled rather a good and pleasant book for general reading.

[1] Edited by C. Halm (Vienna, 1866). There is an English translation by A. Roberts in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* vol. xi (New York, 1893), and an especially good French translation by A. Lavertujon, 2 vols. (Paris, 1896-1899). Sulpicius's biography of Saint Martin of Tours (d. 397) is a pious romance attesting the author's veneration of his hero and full of miraculous adventures. Like other saints' lives, it portrays the general conditions of the time, and is an excellent source if considered in that way.

CHAPTER XI

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): Other Christian Writers

The disorders and general unrest of the fifth century made a deep impression on many Christian writers, who saw in them a punishment for the grievous sins of the Roman world. These writers were only preaching sermons, in which they very naturally exaggerated the punishment as they exaggerated the sins. Their gloomy picture could be expected to enhance the awfulness of the foreshadowed end of all things and the advantage of a speedy transfer of affection from mundane affairs to the life of the world to come. The rising asceticism in Christianity was especially potent in fostering this feeling about the Germans.

Saint Jerome [1] himself embraced the monastic life, and his letters written from Bethlehem make frequent mention of the barbarians. The following extract from a letter written in 395 [2] is an example:

Behold, suddenly messengers rush hither and thither, and the

[1] Born in Dalmatia *cca.* 340, lived a while in Gaul, then in the desert of Chalcis, became a priest at Antioch in 379, a secretary to Pope Damasus in 382, for whom he began his work on the Vulgate, and in 386 fixed his residence in Bethlehem, where he died in 420. His edition and continuation of the chronicle of Eusebius has already been noted (see *supra,* p. 97). Jerome, despite his erudition and travel, gives an impression in many of his epistles and minor works of possessing some journalistic characteristics which we would now style "yellow".

[2] Epistle lxxvii, 8. Translation in J. B. Bury, *Later Roman Empire,* vol. i, p. 69.

whole East trembles with the news that from the far Maeotis, from the land of the ice-bound Don and the savage Massagetae, where the strong works of Alexander on the Caucasian cliffs keep back the wild nations, swarms of Huns burst forth, and flying hither and thither scatter slaughter and terror everywhere, the Roman army being absent in consequence of the civil wars in Italy . . .

May Jesus protect the Roman world in future from such beasts! They were everywhere, when they were least expected, and their speed outstripped the rumor of their approach; they spared neither religion nor dignity nor age; they showed no pity to the cry of infancy. Babes, who had not yet begun to live, were forced to die; and ignorant of the evils that were upon them, as they were held in the hands and threatened by the swords of the enemy, there was a smile upon their lips. There was a consistent and universal report that Jerusalem was the goal of the foes, and that on account of their insatiable lust for gold they were hastening to this city. The walls, neglected by the carelessness of peace, were repaired. Antioch was enduring a blockade. Tyre, fain to break off from the dry land, sought its ancient island. Then we too were constrained to provide ships, to stay on the seashore, to take precautions against the arrival of the enemy, and, though the winds were wild, to fear a shipwreck less than the barbarians—making provision not for our own safety so much as for the chastity of our virgins.

In another letter,[1] Jerome dwells on the wretchedness and misery of human society, which he also illustrates by the raids of Alaric and the fate of Rufinus and Timasius. Speaking of the "wolves of the north," he asks:

How many monasteries were captured? The waters of how many rivers were stained with human gore? Antioch was besieged and the other cities, past which the Halys, the Cydnus,

[1] 396. Epistle lx, 16. From J. B. Bury, *Later Roman Empire*.

the Orontes, and the Euphrates flow. Herds of captives were dragged away; Arabia, Phoenicia, Palestine, Egypt were lead captive by fear.

Jerome indulges in similar hysterical writing about the fate of the entire empire:

O wretched state! . . . For a long time, from the Black Sea to the Julian Alps, those things which are ours have not been ours; and for thirty years, since the Danube boundary was broken, war has been waged in the very midst of the Roman empire. Our tears are dried by old age. Except a few old men, all were born in captivity and siege, and do not desire the liberty they never knew. Who could believe this? How could the whole tale be worthily told? How Rome has fought within her own bosom not for glory, but for preservation—nay, how she has not even fought, but with gold and all her precious things has ransomed her life . . . [1]

Yet the consecration of a single woman to a life of perpetual virginity calls forth a letter in very different strain:

Italy changed her garments of mourning, and the ruined walls of Rome almost resumed their former glory. This signal instance of Divine favor made the Romans feel as if the Gothic army, that off-scouring of all things, made up of slaves and deserters, were already cut to pieces. It made them rejoice more than their ancestors had done over the first victory which succeeded the terrible disaster of Cannae.[2]

Such effusions, if taken together, might furnish us with data for a study of the character and style of Saint Jerome, but not with a trustworthy setting for a history of the Germanic invasions. The personality, the aims, the method, of this monk of Bethlehem are all opposed to accuracy

[1] *Ep. ad Ageruchiam,* Migne, *Patrol. Lat.,* xxii, cols. 1057 *et seq.*

[2] Epistle to Demetrias.

of general statement. But incrusted in his writings, as in others of the period, are many incidental remarks of real historical value, and we must carefully sift facts from metaphors, prose from poetry, reason from imagination. The obviously oratorical exaggeration in such passages as that quoted above,—"How many monasteries were captured? The waters of how many rivers were stained with human gore?"—does not disprove that Antioch was besieged by barbarians; nor have we reason to reject the implication that some Roman citizens were taken prisoners, for the chances are that fact afforded the opportunity for Jerome's outpouring of words,—"Arabia, Phœnicia, Palestine, Egypt were led captive by fear."

Much the same criticism can be made of Salvian, a native of Cologne, who was a priest at Marseilles in the first half of the fifth century, and who wrote, in addition to several strictly religious treatises, a work entitled *Eight Books on the Government of God.*[1] If Salvian is slightly freer from journalistic rhetoric than Jerome and perhaps a little less touched by the horrors of the situation, he is certainly not more trustworthy as an impartial historian or observer. He finds in the barbarians not only the agent of God's vengeance but also an uplifting example, an incentive to holier living. The reader feels instinctively that Salvian in his sermonizing and moralizing efforts makes the Roman citizens too bad and the German immigrants too good:

In what respects can our customs be preferred to those of the Goths and Vandals, or even compared with them? And first, to speak of affection and mutual charity (which, our Lord teaches, is the chief virtue, saying, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another"), almost all barbarians, at least those who are of one

[1] *De gubernatione Dei.* Edited by F. Paully (Vienna, 1883).

race and kin, love each other, while the Romans persecute each other. For what citizen does not envy his fellow-citizen? What citizen shows to his neighbor full charity?

[The Romans oppress each other with exactions] nay, not each other: it would be quite tolerable, if each suffered what he inflicted. It is worse than that; for the many are oppressed by the few, who regard public exactions as their own peculiar right, who carry on private traffic under the guise of collecting the taxes. And this is done not only by nobles, but by men of the lowest rank; not by judges only but by judges' subordinates. For where is the city—even the town or village—which has not as many tyrants as it has curials? . . . What place is there, therefore, as I have said, where the substance of widows and orphans, nay even of the saints, is not devoured by the chief citizens? . . . None but the great is secure from the devastations of these plundering brigands, except those who are themselves robbers . . .

[Nay, the state has fallen upon such evil days that a man cannot be safe unless he is wicked]. Even those in a position to protest against the iniquity which they see about them dare not speak lest they make matters worse than before. So the poor are despoiled, the widows sigh, the orphans are oppressed, until many of them, born of families not obscure, and liberally educated, flee to our enemies that they may no longer suffer the oppression of public persecution. They doubtless seek Roman humanity among the barbarians, because they cannot bear barbarian inhumanity among the Romans. And although they differ from the people to whom they flee in manner and in language; although they are unlike as regards the fetid odor of the barbarians' bodies and garments, yet they would rather endure a foreign civilization among the barbarians than cruel injustice among the Romans.

So they migrate to the Goths, or to the Bagaudes, or to some other tribe of the barbarians who are ruling everywhere, and do not regret their exile. For they would rather live *free* under an appearance of slavery than live as captives under

an appearance of liberty. The name of Roman citizen, once so highly esteemed and so dearly bought, is now a thing that men repudiate and flee from . . .

It is urged that if we Romans are wicked and corrupt, that the barbarians commit the same sins, and are not so miserable as we. There is, however, this difference, that if the barbarians commit the same crimes as we, yet we sin more grievously . . . All the barbarians, as we have already said, are pagans or heretics. The Saxon race is cruel, the Franks are faithless, the Gepidae are inhuman, the Huns are unchaste,—in short, there is vice in the life of all the barbarian peoples. But are their offenses as serious as ours? Is the unchastity of the Hun so criminal as ours? Is the faithlessness of the Frank so blameworthy as ours? Is the intemperance of the Alamanni so base as the intemperance of the Christians? Does the greed of the Alani so merit condemnation as the greed of the Christians? If the Hun or the Gepid cheat, what is there to wonder at, since he does not know that cheating is a crime? If a Frank perjures himself, does he do anything strange, he who regards perjury as a way of speaking, not as a crime?[1]

The nation of the Goths is perfidious but modest, that of the Alani immodest but less perfidious; the Franks are liars but hospitable, the Saxons wild with cruelty, but to be admired for their chastity. All these nations, in short, have their especial good qualities as well as their peculiar vices.[2]

Salvian sums up his main contention as follows:

You, Romans and Christians and Catholics, are defrauding your brethren, are grinding the faces of the poor, are frittering away your lives over the impure and heathenish spectacles of the amphitheatre, you are wallowing in licentiousness. The barbarians, meanwhile, heathen or heretics though they may

[1] iv, 14. From J. H. Robinson, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, pp. 28-30.

[2] vii, 15.

be, and however fierce towards us, are just and fair in their dealings with one another. The men of the same clan, and following the same king, love one another with true affection. The impurities of the theatre are unknown among them. Many of their tribes are free from the taint of drunkenness, and among all, except the Alani and the Huns, chastity is the rule.[1]

Written in somewhat similar spirit is the history of the persecution of the Catholics by the Arian Vandal kings, Genseric and Huniric (427-484), in three books [2] by an ardent bishop, Victor Vitensis or Uticensis. This dreary chronicle is an important source for the Germanic settlements in Africa in the fifth century, not because of special intrinsic worth but because of the scarcity of other and better sources. According to its author, heresy, not German blood, is the vice and crime of the Vandal kings.

Victor, Salvian, Jerome and Orosius, with others of their class,[3] found the qualities of Christian piety and of historical or descriptive objectivity rather incompatible. They are most disappointing as sources relating to the Germanic invasions. Nor do the numerous lives of the saints of the fifth and sixth centuries help us greatly, for they consist chiefly of miracles and prodigies, obscure and uncritical.

[1] From T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders,* vol. i, p. 920.

[2] *Historia persecutionis Vandalicae* or *Africanae ecclesiae sub Geiserico et Hunirico Vandalorum regibus,* edited by C. Halm in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. iii (Berlin, 1879) and by M. Petschenig in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiast.,* vol. vii (Vienna, 1881). German trans. by A. Mally (Vienna, 1884).

[3] Suggestions are occasionally supplied by Vincent of Lerins, the writer on theology; by Eucherius, a preacher at Lyons from 434 to 450; by Paulinus (353-431), bishop of Nola, whose works are now well edited by W. Hartel, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1894); and by acts of church councils. Then too, there are the Christian poets and panegyrists mentioned below.

Occasionally such a biography gives a little glimpse into the life of the time or some detail of interest to the historical student. Such are the life of Bishop Epiphanius of Pavia, written by his successor, Ennodius,[1] about the year 504, and the better known life of Saint Severinus, who labored in Noricum as a missionary to the Germans on the Danube and died in 482. The latter was prepared in 511 by a certain Eugippius, who had been with the saint but was then an abbot near Naples.[2] A few extracts from the biography of Severinus will serve to illustrate saints' lives at their best as historical sources:[3]

On the death of the Hunnish king Attila, great uneasiness prevailed in both the Pannonias and in the other border provinces. It was then that Severinus, a holy servant of God, came from the East to the region where Upper Noricum and the two Pannonias meet, and settled in a little town called Asturis.[4] Here he dwelt in accordance with the gospel and apostolic precepts in piety and in purity of heart and fulfilled his sacred vows by good works in knowledge of the Catholic Faith. Strengthened by these works, he strove zealously for the palm of the heavenly calling.

[1] Ennodius (474-521) also wrote a panegyric on Theodoric and many letters. The best edition of his works is by F. Vogel in the *Monumenta German. Hist., Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. vii (Berlin, 1885). See M. Fertig, *Magnus Felix Ennodius und seine Zeit* (1855-1860); and M. Dumoulin, "Le gouvernement de Théodoric et la domination des ostrogoths en Italie d'après les œuvres d'Ennodius" in *Revue historique* (1901-2).

[2] The best editions are by P. Knoell in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum,* vol. ix (Vienna, 1886); and by T. Mommsen in *Scriptores rer. Germ. in usum schol.* (Berlin, 1898). There is a German translation by K. Rodenberg in the *Geschichtschreiber.*

[3] See also the admirable life of Saint Martin of Tours by Sulpicius Severus.

[4] Probably on the site of modern Klosterneuburg, near Vienna.

One day he went into the church as was his wont and there began with humility to predict the future to the assembled priests, clergy and people, and to urge them to prayers, fasts and works of mercy in view of an impending attack of the enemy. But their minds were choked and defiled by lusts of the flesh, and they judged the preacher's prophecies by the measure of their unbelief. When the servant of God returned to his host's, who was a dignitary in the church, he foretold the day and hour of the approaching destruction, adding, "I am about to leave this stiff-necked city which will soon perish." He thereupon betook himself to the next town, which is called Comagenis.[1]

Comagenis was strongly guarded by its barbarian inhabitants who had become allies of the Romans, and permission to enter or leave was not readily granted. The servant of God, however, was not questioned or refused, although he was absolutely unknown to them. He hastened to the church and admonished all who were despairing of deliverance to arm themselves with fasts, prayers, and good works, and reviewed instances of deliverance in earlier times, how the Lord had protected his people and, contrary to expectation, had miraculously freed them. They were still hesitating to put faith in one who promised safety to all in the presence of gravest danger, when an old man arrived who had recently sheltered such a man in Asturis, and who, upon being questioned by the warders, indicated by his looks and words the ruin of his town, stating that it had been plundered and totally destroyed by barbarians on the very day which a certain man of God had prophesied. Hearing this, they asked in astonishment, "Thinkest thou that it is the same man who promises us in our doubt the help of God?" As soon as the old man perceived the servant of God in the church, he threw himself at his feet and gave thanks to him that he himself was free and had not fallen with his fellow townsmen. When the citizens heard this they sought pardon for their unbelief

[1] Modern Tulln. It lay in Noricum.

and followed up the admonition of the man of God with holy works; they fasted and did penance for their past sins three entire days in church with sighs and lamentations. On the evening of the third day during the celebration of the Sacrifice, the barbarian inhabitants were so frightened at a sudden earthquake that they forced the Romans to open the gates quickly. They pressed out and fled hastily in all directions for they thought themselves encompassed and hemmed in by their hostile neighbors; and being filled by the Lord with fear and confused in the darkness of the night, they struck each other with their swords. Such was the destruction of the enemy, and the people, delivered by God's help, learned through the holy man to contend with heavenly arms . . .[1]

Severinus went from one town to another, preaching and encouraging the people and performing many miracles. He built a cloister, whither came "numerous youths whom he instructed in holy duties, accomplishing more by example than by word," but the troubles of the time did not allow him the life of isolation which he most desired.

The Rugian kingdom was tottering when Flaccitheus succeeded to the throne, for he was on bad terms with the Goths in Lower Pannonia and their great numbers terrified him. He constantly sought advice in his necessity of Saint Severinus as of a divine oracle. On one occasion when he was hard pressed, he came in tears to Severinus and said that he had been asked by the Gothic princes about the pass into Italy, and as he had declined to answer he would doubtless be killed by them. The man of God thereupon advised him: "It is meet that thou seekest my advice about eternal life because the one Catholic faith unites us; and now, because thou art solicitous for thy earthly welfare and asketh me about the life which is common to us all, give ear to my instruction. Fear not the num-

[1] 1, 2.

bers or enmity of the Goths, for they will soon depart hence and thou shalt rule peacefully and with good fortune. Forget not, I pray thee, what I have admonished thee. Despise not to make peace with the least and rely not on thine own might. Cursed be the man, saith Scripture, that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from the Lord.[1] Wherefore, seek to avoid snares, deceive not, and thou shalt die a peaceful death in thine own camp . . . [2] . . . Some barbarians on their way to Italy stopped to see him and entreat his blessing, among whom was Odovacar, later king of Italy, then a tall youth in mean clothes. He had to bow his head as it touched the low ceiling of the cell, and the man of God knew he would sometime be famous. For when he had given him his blessing, he said: "Go to Italy, go, thou who art now clad in poorest skins, shalt then give many rich gifts." [3]

King Feletheus, surnamed Feva, the son of the above-mentioned Flaccitheus, imitated his father's zeal and at the beginning of his reign sought likewise the advice of the holy man. But his wild and evil wife, Giso by name, was always anxious to draw him from the wholesome pursuits of peace. She even tried with other abominable crimes to rebaptize Catholic Christians, but she soon left off because her husband, from fear of holy Severinus, would not concur. Nevertheless, she oppressed Romans with a heavy hand and even commanded that some should be brought to her across the Danube. While she was stopping one day in a village near Favianis, she caused several Romans to be taken across the river and condemned to most wretched slavery. The man of God at once demanded their freedom, but she, inflamed by the fire of womanly wrath, answered spitefully, "Pray for yourself, servant of God, immured in your cell; it is our business to treat with our servants as we will." When the man of God heard this, he said: "I trust in the Lord Jesus that she will be compelled to realize what in her evil desire

[1] Jeremias, xvii, 5. [2] Ch. 5. [3] Ch. 7.

she hath disdained." And there speedily followed a blow which struck her haughty spirit to the ground . . . [1]

While the most distant towns of Upper Noricum were still standing, although no fort was safe from barbarian attacks, the fame of Saint Severinus shone so brightly that every garrison competed with every other for his protection, believing that in his presence no misfortune could befall. And it was not without the favor of divine grace that everyone feared his admonitions as divine utterances and followed his example with good works. . . . [2]

So long as Roman rule was maintained, soldiers were kept in many cities at public expense for the protection of the border wall, but when it was no longer used, the garrisons dissolved and the border wall fell. The Batavinian guard alone remained intact. Some of these soldiers were sent to Italy to obtain the last pay for their comrades, but they were attacked by barbarians on the way, no one knows where. One day Saint Severinus suddenly shut the book which he was reading in his cell, and began to groan and weep, and bade his companions hurry to the river, which they would find at that moment red with human blood. And as a matter of fact it was straightway announced to him that the corpses of those soldiers had been washed ashore by the river current.[3] . . .

At the close of the hard strife and the long battle, when Saint Severinus, enlightened by God, perceived that he was about to pass out of this world, he asked the often mentioned Rugian king, Feva, to come to him with his evil wife, Giso. He charged him with wholesome words that in dealing with his subjects he should always think of the account he would have to render the Lord of the condition of his kingdom, and he boldly added other admonitions. Then he stretched out his hand, and pointing to the king's breast asked the queen reproachfully: "Lovest thou, Giso, this soul more than silver and gold?" When she said she preferred her husband above

[1] Ch. 8. [2] Ch. 11. [3] Ch. 20.

all riches, the wise man of God continued: "Cease then to oppress the innocent lest their affliction break thy rule; for oftentimes thou makest the king's mildness of no avail." But she replied: "Why receivest thou us in this manner, servant of God?" He answered: "I beseech ye, I, a most humble servant, who will soon appear before the Lord, that ye refrain from evil deeds and attend to works of piety. Thus far hath your kingdom thrived by God's grace; henceforth look ye well to it." When the king and his consort were fittingly admonished by these words, they took their departure and went thence.

Thereafter the saint ceased not to speak to his disciples in all kindliness and love about his approaching separation, and what they were to do. "Know, dear Brothers," he said, "as it is written that the children of Israel escaped from the land of Egypt, so is it also determined that all the people of this land shall be freed from the wicked rule of the barbarians. Then shall they all go forth with their possessions from the cities and proceed into the Roman province and no one will rob them of anything. But heed the command of the holy patriarch Joseph, with whose words, I, an unworthy and bad servant, beseech you: God will visit you and you will carry my bones with you out of this land.[1] This will not be of use to me but to you. These places, now still inhabited, will be changed into such a waste solitude that the enemy in quest of wealth will dig up the graves of the dead." And the present condition of things confirms the truth of his prophecy. The saintly father, with pious forethought, ordered his body removed so that when the time of the general migration should come, the community of Brothers whom he had collected, might move together and thus continue bound together in unity and communion of spirit.[2]

[1] Genesis, l, 24. [2] Ch. 40.

CHAPTER XII

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): Poets and Panegyrists

Panegyrists and poets should be treated in the fifth as in every other century merely as panegyrists and poets. Political bias is as destructive of historical accuracy as religious prejudice; slavish devotion to emperor, commander, or senate is little different in essence from blind devotion to God or Church. Poetry, moreover, if really poetry, is apt to be ideal or mystical or at least to represent events as they ought to be rather than as they are. Bad poetry—and much of the poetry of the fourth and fifth centuries was bad,—is only artificial, and the bad poet discovers that form is inexorable, that everything must be subordinated to the needs of rhythm. The poet should be put with the furious friend in the category of the undesirable members of the society of trustworthy historians.

It happens, however, in the case of the panegyrics and of the poems as in that of the edifying religious tracts that an interesting or suggestive statement may be discovered in the midst of the rhetoric or the verse, perhaps an important observation on the conditions of the time. Several examples might be cited.

Eumenius, a native of Autun in Gaul who flourished in the latter part of the third century, addressed flattering speeches to Constantius Chlorus,[1] in one of which he said:

[1] The panegyrics of Eumenius may be found in the *Panegyrici veteres*, ed. by E. Bährens (Leipzig, 1874), together with several

We have seen and we shall still see in the streets of our cities and under our porches long files of captive barbarians, whom the emperor's orders distribute among the inhabitants of the province, waiting to be conducted to the fields which lack laborers and which they must cultivate. Here is then a Chamave and a Frison working for me; the old pillager is changed to a worker and brings his crops to our markets . . . The territories of Beauvais, Troyes, Langres, which lacked *coloni*, today prosper by the labor of the barbarian *coloni*.

Themistius, perhaps the most important of the group, a Greek rhetorician, taught at Constantinople in the second half of the fourth century and enjoyed the favor of several emperors. Constantius made him a senator; Julian called him the foremost philosopher of the age; Theodosius selected him as tutor for Arcadius and in 384 nominated him to a prefecture. Thirty-four of his speeches[1] survive. They are partially philosophical but mainly eulogistic of the emperors he served, and are filled with political and historical allusions. They are surprisingly clear. The defects of panegyrics in general and the particular merits of Themistius are illustrated in the following extract from a tribute paid to Theodosius in 383:

It was considered a great thing when Corbulo induced Tiridates, king of Armenia, to submit to Nero, but the knowledge of the vile character of his master must have saddened even that success to Corbulo. How much greater the happiness of Saturninus who serves such a master as Theodosius! And the Armenians are a race easily lifted up with pride and soon

anonymous panegyrics which came from Gaul. Oratory seems to have prospered in Gaul, even in the Rhenish cities, in the fourth and early fifth centuries.

[1] Edited by L. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1832).

cast down again, a race whose very liberty differs not much from slavery; whereas these barbarians with whom we have to deal are men of most inflexible souls, men to whom the thought of humbling themselves ever so little is far more bitter than death. Yet this is the nation whose chiefs we have seen offering, not some tattered flag, but their very swords, their victorious swords, as a tribute to the emperor; yea, and humbling themselves before him and clasping his knees as Thetis clasped the knees of The Thunderer, that they might hear from his lips the word, the irrevocable word of reconciliation and peace.

Now that name Scythian [Goth], which was so hateful in our ears, how pleasant, how friendly it sounds! Now the Goths celebrate together with us the festival of our prince, which is in truth one of rejoicing for the victories gained over themselves. Do you complain that their race has not been exterminated? I will not ask, "*Could* they have been exterminated?" I will concede that they might have been easily destroyed without loss to ourselves though certainly the history of the Gothic war makes that concession an improbable one. Still, I say, which of the two is better, that Thrace should be filled with corpses or with cultivators of the fields; that we should walk through ghastly desolation or through well-tilled corn-lands? that we should count up the dead men lying there or the ploughers ploughing? Is it better that we should bring Phrygians and Bithynians to settle in the waste lands, or that we should dwell there in peace with the men whom we have subdued? Already I hear from those who have visited those parts that the Goths are working up the iron of their swords and breastplates into mattocks and pruning-hooks, and, bidding a long good-bye to Mars, are paying all their devotions to Ceres and to Bacchus.

The course now pursued by Theodosius is not without a precedent in the history of the republic. Masinissa, once the ally of Carthage, taken prisoner by the Romans and not put to death, became their steadfast friend and a strong de-

fence against the enemies who afterwards attacked them. In our case the State, which like some mighty merchantman strained by wind and wave, was leaking at every seam, is brought into dock and is once more made seaworthy. The roads are again open. The mountains are no longer terrible to the traveler. The plains are now bringing forth their fruits. No longer is the shore of the Danube a stage for the bloody dance of war, but seeds are being hidden in it and ploughs do furrow it. Villas and farm-buildings are again raising their heads. A delightful atmosphere of rest pervades the land; and the empire, like some great living creature, feeling no more the laceration of its wounded members, draws one deep breath of delight for ended sorrow.[1]

Contemporaneous with Themistius was Libanius,[2] who taught at Nicomedia in Bithynia, at Constantinople, and finally at Antioch. He was a warm admirer of Julian, and, though a pagan, numbered among his pupils such men as Basil the Great and John Chrysostom. He left sixty-seven speeches, containing many references to the events of his time, fifty declamations, and two thousand letters [3] addressed to friends and pupils which give us interesting glimpses into the life of a scholar in the eastern provinces during the fourth century.

Symmachus, consul and prefect of the city of Rome in the latter part of the fourth century, was an earnest champion of the pagan religion and of the senate's honor and integrity. Of his writings [4] which have come down to us and

[1] Oration 16, On the choice of Saturninus for the consulship. From T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. i, pp. 318-320.

[2] See G. R. Sievers, *Aus dem Leben des Libanius* (Hamburg, 1863) and O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet* (Leipzig, 1906).

[3] A fourth of these are extant only in Latin translations, and some are of doubtful authenticity.

[4] Edited by O. Seeck in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. vi (Berlin, 1883).

are of some interest for our purposes, we should mention ten books of letters, three panegyrics on Valentinian I and Gratian, a number of official reports to the emperor, and fragments of six senatorial orations.

The chief poets of the time [1] who are occasionally helpful are Ausonius [2] (d. 390), a native of Bordeaux, a tutor of Gratian and a convert to Christianity, who wrote extremely artificial verses; Prudentius [3] (*fl. cca.* 390), a Spanish lawyer and judge, who held imperial office under Theodosius or Honorius and wrote poems with some skill and with tremendous Christian fervor; and Claudian,[4] a pagan, who came to Rome from Alexandria in 395, and won the favor of the influential Stilicho, whose praise he sang in tiresomely rhetorical style and whom he does not seem to have survived. Mr. Hodgkin [5] has freely rendered into English some of Claudian's fulsome verses:

> "Through scenes like these, in winter's thickest snow
> Upon his dauntless course, pressed Stilicho.
> No genial juice to Bacchus there is born,
> And Ceres reaps a niggard store of corn.

[1] See T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1901).

[2] Poems edited by C. Schenkl in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. v (Berlin, 1883); by R. Peiper (Leipzig, 1886); and, with useful notes and an excellent French translation, by H. de La Ville de Mirmont (Bordeaux, 1889). See C. Jullian, *Ausone et Bordeaux, étude sur les derniers temps de la Gaule romaine* (Bordeaux, 1893).

[3] Poems edited by A. Dressel (Leipzig, 1860). There is an English translation of selections by F. St. J. Thackeray with good notes (London, 1890) and also by E. G. Smith (London, 1898). See P. A. J. Puech, *Prudence, étude sur la poésie latine chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (Paris, 1888).

[4] Edited by J. Koch (Leipzig, 1893). See T. Hodgkin, *Claudianus the Last of the Roman Poets* (Newcastle, 1875); J. H. E. Crees, *Claudian as an historical authority* (Cambridge, 1908).

[5] *Italy and her Invaders,* vol. i, pp. 715-6.

But he,—his armor never laid aside—
Tasted the hurried meal, well satisfied;
And, still encumbered with his dripping vest,
Into his frozen steed the rowel pressed.
On no soft couch his wearied members lay,
But when dark night cut short his arduous way
He sought such shelter as some wild beast's cave,
Or mountain-shepherd's hut to slumber gave,
The shield his only pillow. Pale with fear
Surveyed his mighty guest the mountaineer.
And the rude housewife bade her squalid race
Gaze on the unknown stranger's glorious face.
These couches hard the horrent woods below,
Those slumbers under canopies of snow,
Those wakeful toils of his, that ceaseless care
Gave to the world this respite, did prepare
For us unhoped-for rest. From dreadful doom
He, in those Alpine huts, redeemed thee, Rome." [1]

Claudian suggests a different estimate of Stilicho's character from that of Orosius or even that of Zosimus; and although we may naturally distrust the general tenor of Claudian's plainly partisan praises, we cannot justly deny the truth of many of his incidental statements. In fact, we must distinguish carefully in the case of Claudian as in that of all the panegyrists and poets between what is reckless generalization and what is particular historical fact. Thus the above verses, while they indicate that Stilicho fought public enemies somewhere in the mountainous regions of the Italian frontier, may quite possibly convey an extravagant notion of Stilicho's bravery, perseverance and patriotism. For historical purposes, incidental remarks and allusions should be preferred in this kind of source to general theses or interpretations of motives.

Another pagan poet, Rutilius Namatianus, wrote an elegy [2] in several books, describing his return from Rome

[1] *De bello Getico, vv.* 348-362.

[2] *De reditu* or *Itinerarium.* Edited by L. Müller (Leipzig, 1870).

to Gaul about the year 415, of which the first book (644 lines) and a fragment of the second are extant. The poem pays glorious compliment to the beauty, the grandeur, the greatness of Rome and to the universality and eternity of her empire. There is no sigh or lament. And the poem was written only five years after Alaric's raid. The very silence of such a source can be an impressive witness to conditions of the time.

Synesius[1] of Cyrene wrote hymns and a large number of amusing and instructive letters. He was born about 378 of a distinguished family, studied at Alexandria, and became bishop of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica in 410. He witnessed the Vandal invasion of Africa and died about 430.

The warmest admirer of literature who lived in the western provinces in the fifth century was probably Sidonius Apollinaris (430-*cca.* 489). A native of Lyons, he received a good education, married the daughter of the emperor Avitus, was made a senator, prefect of the city and finally bishop of Clermont in Auvergne. He left to posterity poems and a great number of letters[2] which are well written and give us quite a different idea about Gaul in the fifth century from that of Salvian, his pessimistic contemporary. Mr. Hodgkin, who has been interested also in Sidonius and has done the most of his writings into English, says: "Sometimes we carry back into the fifth century the thick darkness which hung over the intellectual life of

[1] Partial edition by J. Flach (Leipzig, 1875). French translation by H. Druon (Paris, 1878). See W. S. Crawford, *Synesius the Hellene* (London, 1901).

[2] Edited by B. Krusch (Berlin, 1887), and in the Teubner texts by P. Mohr (Leipzig, 1895). A French translation, F. Didot (Paris, 1888). See three articles by P. Allard in the *Revue des questions historiques:* "La jeunesse de Sidoine Apollinaris" (Jan., 1908); "Sidoine Apollinaris sous les règnes d'Avitus et de Majorien" (April, 1908); and "Sidoine Apollinaris, préfet de Rome" (Oct., 1908).

Merovingian France or Lombard Italy. In both these estimates we are mistaken. A careful perusal of the three volumes of the letters and poems of Sidonius reveals to us that in Gaul, at any rate, the air still teemed with intellectual life, that authors were still writing, amanuenses transcribing, friends complimenting or criticizing, and all the cares and pleasures of literature filling the minds of large classes of men just as though no empires were sinking and no strange nationalities were suddenly rising around them. We need not believe, upon the authority of the highly-wrought panegyrics of Sidonius, that he had a score of friends all more eloquent than Cicero, more subtle than Plato, and diviner poets than Homer or Virgil; but the interesting fact for us is that such forgotten philosophers and poets did exist in that age, and that their works, produced in lavish abundance, seem to have had no lack of eager students."[1] Sidonius speaks often of the Germans but he treats their immigration and marauding expeditions as merely episodical or as an excuse for trying his epistolary powers:

Sidonius wishes health to his friend Syagrius.

As you are grandson of a consul, and that on the paternal side, as you are sprung (which is more to our present purpose) from a poetic stock, descended from men who would have earned statues by their poems if they had not earned them by their services to the state, all which is shown by those

[1] *Italy and her Invaders,* vol. ii, p. 305. In the pages of Sidonius, we find the names of numerous writers, orators and poets, e. g., Consentius, Lampridius, Leo, Petrus, Sapaudus, Secundinus, Tonantius Ferreolus, Thaumastus, etc. Another interesting source similar to Sidonius is Paulinus of Pella, a rich Aquitanian, who wrote of his life among the Visigoths: edited by W. Brandes in *Corpus script. eccl. Lat.* (Vienna, 1888); see J. Rocafort, *Un type gallo-romain, Paulin de Pella, sa vie, son poème* (Paris, 1896), and C. Caeymaex, "Paulin de Pelle" in *Le musée belge,* vol. i (1897). For Sulpicius Severus, see *supra,* p. 120.

verses of your ancestors which the present generation studies with unimpaired interest,—as these are your antecedents, I cannot describe my astonishment at the ease with which you have mastered the German tongue. I remember that in your boyhood you were well trained in liberal studies, and I am informed that you often declaimed before a professional orator with force and eloquence. But since this is the case, pray tell me whence your soul has suddenly imbibed the oratory of an alien race, so that you who had the phraseology of Virgil flogged into you at school, you who sweated over the long and stately sentences of Cicero, now swoop down upon us like a young falcon from the German language as though that were your old eyrie.

You cannot imagine how I and all your other friends laugh when we hear that even the barbarian is afraid to talk his own language before you lest he should make a slip in his grammar. When you are interpreting their letters, the old men of Germany, bent with age, stand in open-mouthed wonder, and in their transactions with one another they voluntarily choose you for arbitrator and judge. A new Solon when you have to discuss the laws of the Burgundians, a new Amphion when you have to wake music from their three stringed lyre, you are loved and courted, you please, you decree, you are obeyed. And though the barbarians are equally stiff and lumpish in body and mind, yet in you they learn and love the speech of their fathers, the disposition of a Roman.

It now only remains for you, oh most brilliant of wits, to bestow any spare time which may still be yours on reading [Latin], and so to retain that elegance of style which you now possess. Thus while you preserve your Latin that we may not laugh at you, you will practise your German that you may be able to laugh at us. Farewell.[1]

Poets and panegyrists flourished even in Africa during

[1] Epistle v, 5. T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. ii, pp. 358-360.

the fifth and sixth centuries. Their very existence offers interesting suggestions as to conditions among the Vandals. Their writings should be treated as a healthful antidote to Victor's gloomy pictures, his review of religious horrors and his diatribes against heresy.[1] A miscellaneous collection of verse, which was made at Carthage about the year 534, has come down to us filling nearly two hundred pages of manuscript.[2] Creditable poems are preserved of Flavius Felix; of Florentinus, who wrote hexameters in praise of king Thrasamund [3] (496-523); and of Luxorius, the most prolific of them all, who imitated Martial with some success.

Corippus, who lived in Africa about the middle of the sixth century, wrote epic poems on historical subjects with panegyric tendency, of which the *Johannis* is the best. It was written in 549 or 550 and describes in eight books the campaign against the Mauretanians which had just been brought to a successful close by John, master of the soldiery for Africa. It is useful for the topography and history of the country, and though extremely dull it tells the story in a straightforward way. Corippus also wrote a poetical panegyric in four books on Emperor Justin (565-578).[4]

Fabius Fulgentius (*cca.* 480-550), likewise a native of Africa, wrote in addition to many religious treatises a kind of universal history,[5] the fantastic character of which groups

[1] See *supra*, p. 127.

[2] Mainly in the *Codex Salmasianus*, so-called from its former owner, Claude de Saumaise.

[3] Florentinus observes in one place: "Carthage is graced with studies, Carthage is adorned with teachers." *Cf.* Salvian's tribute to Carthage: "illic artium liberalium scholae, illic philosophorum officinae," etc. (vii, 16).

[4] The works of Corippus are edited by M. Petschenig (Berlin, 1886). See P. Ewald, "Zu Corippus in laudem Justini" in *Neues Archiv für ä. deutsch. Geschichte*, vol. vi (1881).

[5] *De aetatibus mundi.*

it naturally with poetry. It appears to have been written in twenty-three books, but only fourteen have come down to us: the first nine books treat of Old Testament events, the tenth of Alexander the Great, the eleventh of Rome from its foundation to the time of Julius Caesar, the twelfth of the Gospel narrative, the thirteenth of the Acts of the Apostles, and the fourteenth of the Roman Empire. Fulgentius states that it is based in part on the books of the poet [!] Xenophon; it is filled with mystical moralizings; and its arrangement is absurd. One letter of the alphabet in succession remains unemployed in the respective books: in book one, letter A; in book two, letter B; etc. The style is thoroughly bombastic and the subject matter unimportant. It is a particularly impressive monument to literary decay.

CHAPTER XIII

Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued): The Chroniclers

The chronicles appear in the fifth and sixth centuries as practically a new kind of source, and aid us in patching together the disjointed statements of Zosimus and the other Greeks, of the ecclesiastical historians, apologists and saint-biographers, of the poets, panegyrists and letter-writers. The chronicles, appearing at first as a subsidiary source, increase in importance with the lapse of time until in the middle age they come finally to dominate the presentation of history.

The chronicles of the fifth century grew out of the *fasti* and *annales* of earlier times. It had anciently been a custom for the *pontifex maximus* to preserve a list of court days (*dies fasti*) on which the praetor could hand down decisions. The list was published by Gnaeus Flavius in 304 B. C. These *fasti* gradually expanded into systematic calendars, of which several, composed after the reforms of Julius Caesar, are preserved, at least in part.[1] Two complete Roman calendars are in existence,—an official list written by a certain Furius Dionysius Philocalus in A. D. 354, and a Christian version of the official calendar, prepared by Polemius Silvius in A. D. 448.

Supplementary to the *fasti* were the *annales*. From ancient times, the *pontifex maximus* was accustomed every

[1] Ovid's *Fasti* is a poetical explanation of the Roman festivals of the first six months.

year to record at the top of a white tablet (*album*), which was exhibited in an open place at his house, the names of the consuls and magistrates, and then below to add a few memorable events. Cicero states [1] that the annals were so kept down to the pontificate of Publius Mucius Scaevola (*cca.* 131 B. C.), after which independent compilations were carried on by various unofficial writers, of whom he names Cato, Pictor and Piso. Annals had also been anciently preserved in the Greek temples, and their continuations gradually merged with the Roman annals in imperial times. Lists of consuls were kept by imperial officers, mainly at Rome and Constantinople, until the reign of Justinian (541), and entries were supplied from time to time by various anonymous persons.

With the growth of Christianity, annals were kept more and more by bishops and monks. A certain Sextus Julius Africanus,[2] who flourished in the early part of the third century, had paved the way in his "Chronographies" by combining pagan and Christian chronology. His system rested on the Jewish idea of a world-epoch of six thousand years, and he was concerned to prove that the Incarnation had taken place in the year 5500, after which there would be five hundred years of waiting till the end of the world and the beginning of the millenium or world-Sabbath. Sextus was followed by Eusebius, the bishop of Caesarea and biographer of Constantine, who prepared a chronicle in Greek [3] relating the origin and history of all nations and kingdoms that he had heard of, from the creation down

[1] *De Oratore*, ii, 12.

[2] See H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1880).

[3] Eusebius (*cca.* 264-340). The text is lost. On his ecclesiastical history, see *supra*, p. 118.

to A. D. 325, and indicating in convenient tables of ten-year periods the names of sovereigns and the principal events from Abraham [1] to Constantine. Then Jerome,[2] the versatile scholar and pamphleteer, edited a Latin version of Eusebius's work and continued it to the year 379.

These annals and chronicles, brief and insignificant before the time of Theodosius the Great, became during the next century slightly larger in bulk and enormously more important. Writers who were too thoughtless or too lazy to prepare histories on the older and grander scale, could at least jot down the dates with accompanying notices of such highly momentous events as earthquakes, and pestilences, and accessions of emperors, and dedications of churches, and shipwrecks, and consecrations of bishops. And our lack of the grander histories has made very precious the few jejune entries of the chroniclers.

The extant annals [3] of the centuries following Theodosius the Great present many difficult problems of authorship and of the sources on which they are based.

Prosper of Aquitaine,[4] a theological writer who flourished about the middle of the fifth century, is credited with a *Chronicon Consulare*,[5] which extends from the point where Jerome stops to the year 455. It has the usual short notices of Roman emperors, Roman bishops and general public oc-

[1] Eusebius held that all Hebrew events before Abraham were "prehistoric," and so he dated events by the years of Abraham, whom he places in 2017 B. C.

[2] *Cca.* 340-420. See *supra*, pp. 121-4.

[3] All these annals have now been brought together by T. Mommsen in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vols. ix, xi, xiii.

[4] See L. Valentin, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine* (Paris, 1900).

[5] Sometimes called *Epitoma chronicon ab a. 379-455.*

currences, but dwells more particularly on the troubles of the church, especially the Pelagian heresy. It is arranged according to the years of the Roman consuls. Another chronicle, a *Chronicon Imperiale,* which bases its computations on the reigns of the emperors instead of on the consuls, comprehends the same period (379-455) and agrees with the former in its general information, although it speaks curtly of the Pelagian heresy. The latter chronicle is now generally ascribed to a certain Prosper Tiro, who, it is imagined, flourished in the sixth century. A third continuation of Jerome's annals, which is particularly useful for the history of Spain to the year 468, was made by Idatius, a bishop in that country. Still another continuator of Jerome was Count Marcellinus, an Illyrian, who was chancellor to Justinian and died probably about 534. Marcellinus gives [1] some interesting notices of events in Illyricum, and for the reigns of Anastasius, Justin and Justinian, his statements, always provokingly brief, have a very high value.

A chronicle, which continues Eutropius from 354 and is of some value for the reigns of Leo and Zeno and the first years of Anastasius, is preserved in a Vienna manuscript in two recensions. The *prior* comes down to 493 and the *posterior* to 539, but both are mutilated, the *prior* having lost that portion relating to the years 404-454. The compilation was first edited, along with some excerpts from a Saint Gall manuscript (*Excerpta Sangallensia*), by Johann Cuspinian in 1553, and hence was long called the *Anonymus Cuspiniani.* It passes now under various names, *Fasti*

[1] The chronicle proper covered the years 379-518, but apparently contemporary writers, whose names are unknown, continued it to 534 and to 548, respectively. The whole work is entitled, *Chronicon quod rerum orientalium historiam Eusebii et Hieronymi usque ad Justiniani tempora prosequitur.*

Vindobonenses, Fasti Ravennates, Chronicon Cuspiniani, Consularia Ravennatia, etc.[1]

Cassiodorus, the influential minister of Theodoric, prepared a brief chronicle to the year 519, which has some importance for the history of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

A French scholar, Henry Valois, published in 1636 two fragments, which have since passed under the name *Anonymus Valesianus*, and which Mommsen has contended belong to distinct writings. *Anonymus A* (*Origo Constantini imperatoris*) antedates the fifth century, while *Anonymus B* (*Chronica Theodericiana*) covers the period 474 to 526 and appears to have been written shortly after the death of Theodoric.[2] The unknown author writes from an imperialistic point of view, speaks most loyally of Zeno, and usually describes Theodoric by the title "patrician." The chronicle is very useful for the history of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy, although it is written in a style bordering on illiteracy.

Annals from 464 to 543 are preserved in a Vatican manuscript as a part of the register of Victor of Aquitaine. They usually pass under the name *Paschale Campanum*.

Victor Tonnennensis,[3] an African bishop who opposed Justinian in the religious controversy of the time[4] and was banished first to the Balearic islands, then to Egypt,

[1] Pallman rather arbitrarily ascribed this work to Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna.

[2] Bethmann, Pertz, Waitz and Holder-Egger ascribe the chronicle to Maximian of Ravenna (*cca.* 498-556), but Bury, Mommsen and Cipolla are skeptical. The best criticism of the work is by C. Cipolla, *Ricerche intorno all' Anonymus Valesianus 2* in *Bullettino dell' Istituto storico Italiano,* number 11 (Rome, 1892). For an extract from the Valesian Fragment, see *infra,* p. 164, note.

[3] Or *Tunnunensis.*

[4] The Three Chapter Controversy.

and finally to Constantinople, wrote in exile a chronicle from the creation to the year 566. The part from 444 is extant. Victor made use principally of western sources for the statements from 444 to 457 and from 501 to 563, and of eastern sources for the others.

A bishop of Avenches in the latter part of the sixth century, Marius by name,[1] continued Prosper Tiro's chronicle, with extremely brief notices, from 455 to 581.

A single manuscript of another continuation of Prosper from 455 to 641 was discovered by Waitz at Copenhagen in 1836 and edited as the *Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi.* It was probably compiled in Italy in the seventh century towards the end of the reign of Heraclius. The extant manuscript presents three parallel versions, an *Ordo prior,* an *Ordo posterior,* and marginal notes or *Ordinis posterioris margo.* It is called the "Lombard Chronicle" by Bethmann and the " Chronicle of 641 " by Holder-Egger.

Striking similarities between some of these chronicles and fragments of others which have come down to us, have led modern scholars to assert that most of them were drawn from a common source which is now lost. According to the theory of Mommsen, it was a chronicle based on the *fasti* of Constantinople, first published in 387 and afterwards brought up to date from time to time by the care of booksellers. In the sixth century after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, it was probably re-edited and carried on by Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna, whose chronicle is cited by the later annalist Agnellus. It would thus be the main source for the two Prospers, Count Marcellinus, Marius Aventicensis, Cassiodorus, and for the later chroniclers, Isidore of Seville, Paul the Deacon, Theophanes, etc. It must be remembered, however, that this work, to

[1] Marius Aventicensis.

which Mommsen gave the name *Chronica Italica*,[1] is purely hypothetical.

In order to illustrate the brevity and vagueness of this kind of source, we have chosen the year 476, which was marked by a little revolution in Italian politics that has been most preposterously exaggerated into the fall of the western empire—as if there were a western empire to fall [2]—and which, judged by the average entries in the various chronicles, is neither more nor less important than any other year. We give the notice from each of the chronicles which have been mentioned above:

[1] O. Holder-Egger edited a theoretical reconstruction of the work in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutschen Geschichte*, vol. i, pp. 347-368 (1876), under the title *Annales Ravennatenses 379-572*. G. Waitz had previously used this title, but Mommsen preferred the title *Chronica Italica* on the ground that it had been begun before Ravenna became an important imperial city.

[2] It is, of course, as preposterous to maintain the existence of two Roman empires because the sources speak of an eastern and of a western empire, as to reason from our usual expressions about Western Europe and Eastern Europe that there are two Europes. It had long been customary for two, three or even four emperors to exercise common control over the state, though with separate capitals; and the laws of the empire were issued in the name and with the consent of all the emperors who happened to be reigning. A single emperor might exercise particular administrative power over a definite portion of the empire, subject to special agreement with his colleague or colleagues. But the commonwealth (*respublica*) and the imperial power (*imperium*) were each indivisible and one. Professor J. H. Robinson in an address on "The Fall of Rome" (Boston, 1907, printed privately) has pointed this out clearly in correcting some current popular misapprehensions in regard to the process of dissolution of the Roman empire.

PROSPER OF AQUITAINE

[closes in 455.]

PROSPER TIRO

[closes in 455.]

IDATIUS

[closes in 468.]

COUNT MARCELLINUS:

Consulship of Basiliscus and Armatus. The tyrant Basiliscus had his son Marcus named Caesar, and, being puffed up with pride, attempted to support the Nestorian heresy against the Catholic faith, but his fall followed. For Zeno, being restored to imperial power, banished Basiliscus with his son and wife Zenonida to a little town called Leminis in the province of Cappadocia. Rumor says he was killed. Odovacar, king of the Goths, occupied Rome. Odovacar slew Orestes on the spot. Odovacar condemned Augustulus, the son of Orestes, to banishment to the Lucullan villa in Campania. The imperial power of the Roman people in the west, which Octavian Augustus, the first of the Augusti, commenced to exercise in the 709th year of the city, perished with this Augustulus in the 522nd year of the empire, and thenceforth Gothic kings held Rome.

ANONYMUS CUSPINIANI, PRIOR RECENSION:

Second consulship of Basiliscus and first of Armatus. In this consulship Odovacar was raised king on August 23rd. This year the patrician Orestes was killed at Piacenza, August 28th. This year his brother Paul was killed in the pines near Ravenna, September fourth.

ANONYMUS CUSPINIANI, POSTERIOR RECENSION:

[no entry.]

CASSIODORUS:

Second consulship of Basiliscus and first of Armatus. During this consulship Orestes and his brother Paul were killed by

Odovacar, who assumed the title of king but did not use the purple or royal insignia.

ANONYMUS VALESIANUS:

While Zeno Augustus was reigning at Constantinople, Patrician Nepos, coming suddenly to Portus, deprived Glycerius of imperial power. Glycerius was made a bishop and Nepos emperor at Rome. Nepos came presently to Ravenna, but, fearing Patrician Orestes who was following him with an army, took ship and fled to Salona. There he remained five years and was assassinated by his own followers.

Soon after his departure Augustulus was made emperor and reigned ten years [!]. Augustulus, who before his reign had been called Romulus by his parents, was made emperor by his father, Patrician Orestes. Odovacar, however, with the people of the Scyri, coming suddenly on Patrician Orestes, killed him at Piacenza, and afterwards his brother Paul in the pine woods outside Classis [the port of Ravenna]. He took Ravenna, moreover, and deposed Augustulus, but had compassion on his youth and beauty, and spared his life besides paying him a sum of six thousand *solidi*. He sent him into Campania, where he lived undisturbed with his relatives. His father, Orestes, was a Pannonian, who had attached himself to Attila when the latter came into Italy and had been made his secretary, whence he had been advanced until he had reached the dignity of patrician.

PASCHALE CAMPANUM:

Basiliscus Augustus for second time and Armatus, consuls. Odovacar is elevated August twenty-third.

VICTOR TONNENNENSIS:

[no entry under 476, but the following under 473:]

Leo for the sixth time and Probinus, consuls. . . . During this consulship, Olybrius comes to Rome and takes the imperial power from Anthemius who has been reigning through the influence of the faction of Patrician Ricimir. The former being recognized, Anthemius flees and is killed. And after

several days, Herculanus, son of Orestes, usurps the imperial power and is killed with his father, and Nepos takes his kingdom [!].

MARIUS AVENTICENSIS:

Basiliscus and Armatus, consuls. Odovacar was raised to the kingship.

CONTINUATIO HAVNIENSIS PROSPERI, ORDO PRIOR:

Basilius and Armatus, consuls. In Italy, the Eruli, who were subject to Roman law, created a king, Odovacar by name, August twenty-third, a worthy man in age and wisdom and versed in military affairs. He fell upon Patrician Orestes who was stopping at Piacenza and defeated him, and killed his brother, Paul by name, near Ravenna. The ills of the commonwealth increase from all sides; pressed by the peoples everywhere, it loses provinces and dominion.

CONTINUATIO HAVNIENSIS PROSPERI, ORDO POSTERIOR:

Basiliscus for the second time and Armatus, consuls. Odovacar was elevated king by his army, August twenty-third. Patrician Orestes was killed at Piacenza and his brother Paul at Ravenna.

CONTINUATIO HAVNIENSIS PROSPERI, MARGINAL NOTE:

Amid the ills and unexpected shipwreck of the commonwealth, while the Romans were wasting their strength within, foreign tribes which had submitted to the Roman law with feigned friendship, rose against the state. Thus the Heruli, who dwelt in Italy, created a king, Odovacar by name, an able man in skill and knowledge and versed in military affairs. He fell upon Patrician Orestes, who was stopping with his army at Piacenza, and overthrew him. The latter's brother, Paul by name, who lived at Ravenna, was surprised by Odovacar's army and perished in the pines, August thirty-first. . . .

CHAPTER XIV

Other Sources from Theodosius the Great to Justinian (Continued)

Three writers of the sixth century deserve special mention: Cassiodorus, the prime minister of Theodoric; Jordanes, the Gothic historian of his own people; and Procopius, who served in the wars of Justinian.

Cassiodorus [1] was the son of an official of Odovacar who subsequently embraced the cause of Theodoric. He was born about 480, performed various public services, becoming master of the offices sometime before 526, and died about 570. Among his voluminous writings were the chronicle already noted, theological works, text-books on the liberal arts, twelve books of official letters, and a history of the Goths.

The letters (*Variae*), which were published about 537, constitute a very valuable mine for the history of the Ostrogothic kingdom.[2] The first five books contain letters written by Cassiodorus as quaestor or as master of the offices in the name of King Theodoric; the sixth and seventh, the formulas of appointment to various dignities; the eighth and ninth, letters written in the name of Atha-

[1] Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator. He was not commonly called Cassiodorus until in the eighth century, by Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, i, 25.

[2] The best edition is by T. Mommsen in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. xii (Berlin, 1894). See T. Hodgkin, *The Letters of Cassiodorus, being a condensed Translation of the Variae* (London, 1886).

laric; the tenth in the names of Amalasuentha, Theodohad and his wife, and Witigis. The eleventh and twelfth are composed entirely of letters written by Cassiodorus in his own name as pretorian prefect. The *Variae* "are State papers put into the hands of an *improvisatore* to throw into form, and composed with his luxuriant verbiage, and also with his coarse taste. The shortest instructions begin with an aphorism or an epigram. If they are more important or lengthy, they sparkle and flash with conceits or antitheses, and every scrap of learning, every bit of science or natural history, every far-fetched coincidence which may start up in the writer's memory, however remote in its bearing on the subject, is dragged in to exalt or illustrate it, though the subject itself may be of the plainest and most matter-of-fact kind. You read through a number of elaborate sentences, often tumid and pompous, sometimes felicitous and pointed, but all of the most general and abstract sort; and nestling in the thick of them, towards the end of the letter or paper, you come upon the order, or instruction, or notification, for which the letter or paper is written, almost smothered and lost in the abundance of ornament round it." [1]

Cassiodorus was a Roman citizen politically dependent on Theodoric, and it was therefore natural that he should seek by every means to exalt the Gothic chieftain's rule and to ensure the firm loyalty of all Roman citizens in Italy. That purpose is evident in the letters from start to finish. It was doubtless also the controlling motive in the preparation of a work in twelve books on the history of the

[1] Dean Church in *The Church Quarterly Review* (July, 1880). Contemporary with the *Variae* of Cassiodorus were the important and interesting letters of Bishop Ennodius (473-521) of Pavia, edited by F. Vogel in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. vii (Berlin, 1885).

Goths, which is preserved to us only through a hasty epitome by an illiterate monk.

We should like to think that Cassiodorus, being in a position of great influence and with every possible opportunity to know the barbarians, had composed his Gothic history in a strictly scientific spirit, that he had mastered the tribal traditions and legends, that he had diligently investigated every Germanic source, that he had presented the facts calmly and with critical insight. But all we know about the work tends to prove the opposite. A laudatory letter in the *Variae*, purporting to have been written by king Athalaric, affirmed that

> he carried his researches up to the very cradle of the race, gathering from the stores of his learning what the Goths had forgotten. He drew forth the Gothic kings from the dim lurking place of ages, restoring to the Amal line the splendor that truly belonged to it, and clearly proving that for seventeen generations our ancestors had been kings. Thus did he assign a Roman origin to Gothic history, weaving as it were into one chaplet the flowers which he had culled from the pages of widely-scattered authors.[1]

Cassiodorus seems to have done more than a scientific historian could do, for he remembered what had been forgotten, and constructed for the reigning family a fine genealogy of seventeen kings, and, if we may presume to interpret the "Roman origin" of Gothic history, discovered the ancestors of the Goths in company with the ancestors of Romulus and Remus in the great city of Troy! The Gothic history of Cassiodorus was apparently a panegyric, and its author was rewarded with the title of pretorian prefect.

The illiterate monk who epitomized this lost work of

[1] *Variae*, ix, 25.

Cassiodorus and added statements of his own was Jordanes,[1] a native of Lower Moesia. He lived in the reign of Justinian, and his grandfather had been the secretary of Candac, a chieftain of Scyri, Sadagarii and Alani, who had adopted the Gothic name. Jordanes himself was the secretary of Candac's nephew until he entered the church. The passages in which he speaks of his family [2] lead us to think that he was a Goth.

It may seem fortunate on first thought that we have a history written by a Goth. All the sources we have thus far examined have been the work of Roman citizens. But second thought will show that Jordanes was rather a Roman than a barbarian. His family was separated from the Goths. His grandfather was secretary of an Alan king in close alliance with the emperor. He himself was a Catholic while his people were Arians. He became a monk within the empire. His education and language were Latin, not Gothic. His patriotism was Roman, not German. He believed Rome would remain mistress of the tribes. He spoke of the emperors only with respect and pronounced himself a loyal subject of Justinian.[3]

Jordanes states in his preface that his chief source was Cassiodorus:

You have persuaded me to condense in my own words in this single slight book the twelve books of Senator [i. e., Cassiodorus] on the origin and deeds of the Getae from earliest times down to the present through succession of kings and generations. . . . The task has been too heavy for me because

[1] Spelled *Jornandes* by Grimm and Gibbon, and *Jordanis* by Waitz and Wattenbach. The spelling *Jordanes,* used by Muratori and Mommsen, is now preferred. The oldest manuscripts have *Jordanes* and *Jordanis,* never *Jornandes.*

[2] 50, 60. [3] These facts are gathered from chapters 25, 50, 60.

the use of these books has not been granted me to such an extent that I might follow them closely, but, that I may not speak falsely, I have recently reread these books, thanks to the custodian, during three days. Although I do not reproduce the words literally, I believe, however, that I have preserved in their integrity the thoughts and deeds. I have joined thereto details from certain Greek and Latin histories, adding myself the beginning, the end and considerable in the body of the work. . . .[1]

The statement of our illiterate monk that he had used this principal source three days may signify either that he had superhuman energy in reading, reflecting and composing, or that he was a modest liar. Several other statements of Jordanes would incline us to accept the latter estimate.

Among the "certain Greek and Latin histories" mentioned throughout the work as additional sources are the writings of Tacitus and Dio Cassius on the ancient Germans, Ptolemy on the island of Scanzia, and, in general, Trogus Pompeius, Orosius, Priscus and Ablavius.[2] Jordanes alleges that the Goths had ancient traditions and poetry, but whether he knew them himself or used them he does not say. Perhaps the lost Ablavius was sole authority for their existence. We know that Jordanes used Roman sources; we do not know whether he used German sources.

The Gothic history by this alleged Goth is divided into sixty short sections.[3] The first thirteen, treating of the early

[1] Dedicatory preface to a certain Castalius.

[2] Jordanes mentions (c. 15) a Roman history by Symmachus, which has not come down to us.

[3] *De rebus Geticis,* or *Historia de Gothorum* or *Getarum origine et rebus gestis* or *De origine actibusque Getarum.* The best editions are by T. Mommsen in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. v (Berlin, 1882), and by A. Holder (Freiburg i. B., 1882). There is an English translation by C. C. Mierow (Princeton, 1908);

wanderings of the Goths, are thoroughly unreliable and are generally rejected. The reconstruction of an ancient history for that people by mistakenly identifying them with the Getae and with the Scythians might have some justification in the former case in the confusion resulting from the resemblance of names, and in the latter case in the geographical comprehensiveness of the term Scythia as applied by earlier writers to all the northern and eastern peoples before they appeared in large numbers within the empire, but it is none the less fanciful and without fact. The fourteenth section of the history distinguishes Ostrogoths from Visigoths.[1]

a German translation by W. Martens in the *Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* (Leipzig, 1884); and a French translation by A. Savagner, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1883). To Jordanes is ascribed a very brief abridgment of universal history derived mainly from Florus: *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum,* or *De regnorum et temporum successione,* or *Liber de origine mundi et actibus Romanorum cetarumque gentium,* or *De gestis Romanorum.* Edited by T. Mommsen in *Monumenta, ibid.*

[1] It is impossible to say definitely when or how the Goths were divided into two distinct groups, the East and the West Goths. The life of Claudius in the Augustan Histories, which was written early in the fourth century, mentions (ch. 6) "Austrogothi," and near the close of the same century the poet Claudian (*contra Eutropium,* ii, 153) speaks of "Ostrogothis." The Visigothic name first appears considerably later. In the middle of the fifth century, Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of "Vesi" in two places (Panegyric to Avitus, *an.* 456; Panegyric to Majorian, *an.* 458). The *Variae* of Cassiodorus make frequent mention of the Visigoths but do not use the term Ostrogoth. According to Jordanes, the word Ostrogoth came from a certain King Ostrogotha, who was a contemporary of Emperor Philip (224-229). It has been suggested that at first (*cca.* 300-400) the distinction was between Ostrogoths and Goths, and that the name Visigoth was a later appellation. Hodgkin, after confessing serious difficulties, accepts as probable the identification of the Greuthungi and Thervingi, distinctions made by Ammianus Marcellinus, with the Ostrogoths and Visigoths respectively, but Bury rejects that view emphatically. *Cf.* Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders,* vol. i, pp. 100-102, note; Bury's edition of Gibbon, Appendix 16, vol. i, p. 459.

The fifteenth gives an account of Emperor Maximin, who may have been of Gothic origin, and the sixteenth opens with the reign of Philip. From this point onwards, the narrative runs side by side with the authentic history of the empire.

Jordanes is explicit on the devotion of his people to the commonwealth:

. . . After the death of Athanaric, his whole army remained in the service of emperor Theodosius, submitting to the Roman rule and making of the soldiery but one body, as it were; and these reviving the thousands of *foederati* whom emperor Constantine had formerly had, were themselves called *foedcrati.* The emperor, perceiving their fidelity and friendship towards himself, led more than twenty thousand of them against the tyrant Eugenius, who had siezed Gaul after the murder of Gratian. He conquered this usurper and obtained his revenge.[1]

His account of Alaric is far less detailed than that of Zosimus, and probably conveys a less truthful impression:

After Theodosius, that friend of peace and of the Gothic nation, had quitted this life, and when his sons, living in luxury, began to annihilate both parts of the commonwealth and to filch from their *foederati,* the Goths, their accustomed gifts, the Goths soon conceived an increasing contempt for those princes; and fearing lest their own valor should be relaxed by a long peace, they ordained over themselves a king, named Alaric, who in point of nobility was second only to the Amals, his marvelous origin being derived from the family of the Balthes, who for their bravery had formerly received that name, meaning brave. Presently then, the aforesaid Alaric, being made king and entering into deliberation with his people, persuaded them to seek a kingdom for themselves by their own labors rather than to serve others in idleness, and,

[1] Ch. 28.

having gathered an army together, he crossed the Pannonias and Sirmium during the consulship of Stilicho and Aurelian, and entered Italy. . . .[1]

The narrative of Alaric's campaigns and of the subsequent movements of the Visigoths in Italy is chaotic; in points it flatly contradicts Zosimus and Orosius and in others it is itself most confusing.[2] It is *prima facie* evidence in support of the author's contention that he had studied his chief source but three days.

Greater reliance is placed on the statements concerning the Gothic settlements in Gaul, the invasions of the Huns and the defeat of Attila in the battle of the Catalaunian Plains, commonly called the battle of Châlons, not because Jordanes suddenly becomes inherently more trustworthy but because there is no longer a Zosimus or even an Orosius to contradict him. Jordanes is the great and practically the only source relating to the battle of Châlons![3]

Jordanes traces the history of the Visigoths in sections forty-three to forty-seven from the battle of Châlons (451) to the accession of Alaric II in 485. Then he takes up the story of the Ostrogoths from their conquest by the Huns through their various settlements in the empire until the occupation of Italy by Theodoric (sections 48-57). The last three sections deal with the reign of Theodoric, the Goths in Spain and the conquest of Justinian. The narrative becomes more meager but doubtless more reliable

[1] Ch. 29.

[2] Yet Jordanes is the sole authority for that oft-repeated tale of the strange burial of Alaric.

[3] Chs. 37-41. Jordanes says it was "a battle obstinate, furious, horrible, such as was never seen in memory of man....; a little stream flowing through the middle of the plain was so swollen by the blood shed that it became a roaring torrent."

as it becomes more contemporary. Its imperial bias, however, does not prevent a plain, straightforward account of the relations between Theodoric and the Roman empire, perhaps as illuminating as any that we have:

Emperor Zeno, well satisfied to learn that Theodoric was established king of his nation, sent him an invitation to visit Constantinople and received him with suitable honor, ranking him among the noble courtiers. Afterwards, in order to bestow on him a greater honor, he adopted him as a son in arms, and accorded him a triumph in the capital. Theodoric was made consul, which is conceded to be the greatest honor in the world. Nay more; Zeno had an equestrian statue erected opposite the imperial palace in his honor.

Meanwhile Theodoric, allied to the empire of Zeno, hearing that his nation, abiding as we have said in Illyricum, was not too well supplied with the necessities of life while he was enjoying all the good things of the capital, and choosing rather, after the usage of his people, to seek food by labor than to enjoy in idleness the favors of the Roman realm while his people were living in poverty, made up his mind and spoke thus to the prince: "Though nothing is wanting to me for my service to your empire, nevertheless, if your Piety think fit, I pray you to hear freely the desire of my heart." Then, as was wont, leave was granted him to speak without reserve. "Why," he asked, "is the western country, which has long been governed under the sceptre of your predecessors, and that city, the head and sovereign of the world, now shaken by the usurped authority of a king of the Turcilingi and Rugians? Send me thither, if it please you, with my people, that you may be relieved from the expense which we cause you here, and that there, if by the Lord's help I conquer, the fame of your Piety may spread its rays. For it is fitting that I, your son and servant, if victorious, should hold that kingdom as your gift; but it is not fitting that he [Odovacar], whom you do not recognize, should press his tyrannical yoke upon

your senate, and that a part of the commonwealth should languish in bondage. In brief, if I conquer, I shall possess those lands through your gift and by your generosity: if I am conquered your Piety will lose nothing, but rather, as before said, will save the heavy charges which we now entail." On hearing this speech, the emperor, though sorry to part with Theodoric, yet not wishing to sadden him by a refusal, granted what he desired; and after overwhelming him with rich presents, dismissed him, commending to his protection the Senate and the People of Rome.

[Theodoric then led his people into Italy and besieged Odovacar for three years in Ravenna.] All Italy proclaimed Theodoric its sovereign and thus the commonwealth obeyed his nod . . . Odovacar, perceiving no means of escape, sent an embassy to ask pardon. Theodoric at first granted his request but later took his life. It was finally, as we have said, in the third year after his entrance into Italy that Theodoric, by advice of Emperor Zeno, laid aside the costume of his nation and assumed the mantle, the insignia of royalty, as king thenceforth of Goths and Romans.[1]

Theodoric sent an embassy to Clovis, king of the Franks, to ask for the hand of his daughter Audefleda. Clovis was

[1] *Cf.* the statements in the Valesian Fragment: "Zeno rewarded Theodoric with favors, making him patrician and consul, giving him many gifts and even sending him to Italy. Theodoric stipulated that if he should conquer Odovacar, he should rule in his stead as a reward for his labors until the emperor should arrive.....

"Odovacar fled to Ravenna, whither Patrician Theodoric followed him as far as the Pine-woods and besieged Odovacar three years in Ravenna, until wheat brought six *solidi* a measure. Theodoric sent Faustus, the president of the senate, on an embassy to Emperor Zeno in the hope of obtaining the purple....but as the news of that emperor's death and of the succession of Anastasius arrived before the embassy returned, the Goths confirmed Theodoric as their king without waiting for an order from the new emperor.....

"Later, he made an agreement with Anastasius through the mediation of Festus, for a formal assumption of control, and the emperor returned all the ornaments of the palace which Odovacar had sent to Constantinople." (Chapters 49, 53, 57, 64.)

pleased to further the suit, for he thought that such an alliance would unite his sons . . . with the Goths. The two peoples, nevertheless, continued their mutual hostility on account of the lands in Gaul, although, so long as Theodoric lived, the Goths never yielded to the Franks . . . Theodoric gave his two daughters in marriage to neighboring kings, one to Alaric [II], king of the Visigoths, the other to Sigismund, king of the Burgundians . . . . Upon learning that Eutharic, a descendant of the Amals, a young man distinguished for his wisdom and valor as well as for his strength, was living in Spain, he summoned him to Italy and married him to his own daughter, Amalasuentha. And in order to extend the influence of his family as far as possible, he sent as wife to Trasemund, king of the Vandals, his sister, Amalafreda, the mother of Theodahad, who succeeded to the kingship. To Hermenfred, king of the Thuringians, moreover, he gave his niece, Amalaberga. . . .

[Theodoric, by means of his counts, reduced Sirmium, and defeated the Franks in Gaul.] The latter left more than thirty thousand on the battlefield. After the death of his son-in-law, Alaric [II], he appointed Thiodis, his armor-bearer, regent for his grandson Amalaric in the Spanish kingdom. Amalaric fell into the snares of the Franks while still a youth, and lost his crown and his life. Then the regent Thiodis usurped the throne, delivered Spain from the base pretensions of the Franks, and ruled the Visigoths until his death. Thiodigisglossa succeeded him in power, but was assassinated before he had really exercised his authority. He was followed by Hactenusagil, who holds the kingdom to the present day. Athanagilda has rebelled against him and is even now provoking the forces of the Roman empire; Patrician Liberius is on the way with an army to oppose him.

Throughout the life-time of Theodoric, there was not a single tribe in the west which did not serve him either as friend or as subject.

When, in his old age, he felt that his end was nigh, he con-

vened the Gothic counts and leaders, and designated Athalaric as his successor, a child of barely ten years, the son of his recently widowed daughter, Amalasuentha. He urged them as his last wishes to respect their king, to love the Roman senate and people, and to live always under the protection and favor of the eastern prince, as next after God. And to his injunctions they were faithful so long as king Athalaric lived, about eight years. During that time, however, the Franks, who scorned the child, seized what his father and grandfather had taken in Gaul. Athalaric continued to hold the other states in peace, and entrusted the protection of his youth and of his mother's widowhood to the eastern prince. But in a short time the ill-fated boy was carried off by an untimely death and departed from earthly affairs.

Amalasuentha, not wishing to expose herself to the scorn of the Goths on account of the weakness of her sex, summoned to the throne a cousin, Theodahad, her next of kin, who had been living in private life in Tuscany. Theodahad forgot the ties of blood and exiled Amalasuentha from the palace at Ravenna to an island in Lake Bolsena. There she lived a brief time stricken with sorrow, and was at length strangled in the bath by his hirelings.

Justinian, the emperor in the east, was stirred by the news of this infamous crime as by a personal affront. His faithful patrician, Belisarius, had just triumphed over the Vandals in Africa, and without loss of time and while his arms were still wet with Vandal blood, he directed this general to lead an expedition against the Goths.

[Belisarius first occupied Sicily and then southern Italy. One of the Gothic leaders deserted to him] and testified his desire to serve the princes of the Roman empire. The Gothic army, suspecting Theodahad of complicity in this treason, clamored for his deposition and the elevation of Witigis, his armor-bearer. This was done immediately, and Witigis, being proclaimed in the barbarian camps, occupied Rome and caused Theodahad to be put to death . . .

The Roman army, which had meanwhile crossed the strait, now marched through Campania, took Naples, and entered Rome a few days after the departure of King Witigis, who went to Ravenna and married Mathasuenta, a daughter of Amalasuentha and grand-daughter of King Theodoric. The Roman army occupied all the strongholds of Tuscany while the marriage festivities were in progress. When Witigis learned what had happened, he sent an armed force to take Perugia, but Roman troops raised the siege and destroyed the besiegers. Whereupon, Witigis, like a roaring lion, collected the whole Gothic army, quitted Ravenna, and began a long siege of Rome. His boldness, however, was of no avail, for at the end of fourteen months he abandoned the siege and moved against Rimini. There likewise he failed, and, being put to flight, retreated to Ravenna. Immediately surrounded in this city, he voluntarily surrendered himself together with his wife Mathasuenta and the royal treasury.

Thus in the year 1300 from the founding of the city, through the efforts of the faithful consul Belisarius, Emperor Justinian, who had then long been reigning, conquered a famous kingdom and a warlike nation. The prince honored Witigis with the title *patrician* and took him to Constantinople. There Witigis died after a sojourn of two years, during which he lived in high favor with the emperor. Justinian caused Mathasuenta, the widow of the Gothic king, to marry his brother, Patrician Germanus. A posthumous son was born after the death of Germanus. In his person the mingled blood of the Anicii and of the Amals gives us the hope of seeing preserved, by God's grace, the virtues of both families.

Thus we have recited the origin of the Getae and the nobility of the Amals and the exploits of brave men. This glorious race has yielded to a prince far more glorious, and to a most valiant general, whose fame will not be dimmed in any coming century or generation. That is why Emperor Justinian, victorious and triumphant, and Consul Belisarius are each surnamed *Vandalicus, Africanus,* and *Geticus.*

That is practically all of the Gothic history of Jordanes which can be called contemporary. On the reign of Theodoric it presents fewer facts than the Valesian fragment. On the social relations of the two peoples—Roman and Gothic—it has hardly a suggestion, and is therefore, in that respect, greatly inferior to the Letters of Cassiodorus. The few statements about the Gothic kingdom immediately following the death of Theodoric are the most authentic and the most valuable. The expedition of Belisarius against the Goths is much better detailed by Procopius, who was not a monk but a soldier.

Procopius, a native of Caesarea, was born about 490 and probably belonged to the official aristocracy. He was in any event a warm admirer of Justinian's celebrated general, Belisarius, whom he accompanied in an official capacity on the campaigns against the Persians, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths. He served thus in the East from 527 to 531, in Africa from 533 to 536, and then three years in Italy. This experience gave him an acquaintance with military affairs such as no writer had had since Ammianus Marcellinus and likewise an excellent opportunity to study the peoples with whom he came in contact. Procopius, moreover, had little in common with the illiterate Jordanes, for he was an educated man, well versed in ancient literature and able to write Greek in a style tolerably comparable with that of the masters.

The important work of Procopius for our purposes is the *History of his Own Time*[1] in eight books, published be-

[1] There is a complete edition by G. Dindorf (Bonn, 1833) with a faulty Latin translation. The best edition on the Gothic war is now that of D. Comparetti in *Le fonti per la storia d'Italia* (Rome, 1895 *et seq.*), with an Italian translation. There is a German translation of the Gothic War by D. Coste in the *Geschichtschreiber* (Leipzig, 1885).

Other works are attributed to Procopius: a panegyric on Emperor

tween 550 and 560. The first two books treat of the wars with the Persians, the third and fourth of the campaigns in Africa (395-545), the fifth, sixth and seventh of the Gothic War (487-553), while the eighth book presents a brief summary of general events to the year 554.

Our pleasure at finding in the middle of the sixth century a writer who writes well and who seems capable of rising above the political and religious passions of the time after a whole century and a half of dreary chronicle and vulgar bombast, must not blind our eyes to several serious drawbacks in the histories of Procopius. In the first place, he is careless and uncritical in the use of sources, and has been convicted of numerous errors. He contradicts too many other authorities to guarantee his trustworthiness for the history of events previous to his own time.[1] In the second place, he has a strong imperial bias: he is the devoted friend of Justinian and Belisarius; he is captivated by the civilizing and cultural mission of the Roman empire to the barbarian world; he defends valiantly the imperial laws and customs and distrusts innovation; and his class sympathies are with the aristocracy of wealth. And finally, his very literary virtues at times become vices, on account of his servile imitation of Herodotus and Thucy-

Anastasius; an account of the buildings restored under Justinian's auspices; and notably a "Secret History" which seems to have been an anonymous political pamphlet and is often called the ninth book of the *History of his Own Time*. The Secret History is to be found in the *Bonn edition*.

The history of Procopius was continued by Agathias, whose work covering in five books the years 552-558 is especially useful for Italian affairs; and in turn by Menander from 558 to 582. The history of Agathias and the extant fragments of the work of Menander are in the Bonn edition.

[1] The charming story of Emperor Honorius and his pet hen, Roma, is only an unreliable anecdote; Procopius is the sole authority.

dides. As Bury says, when we find incidents at the siege of Amida reproduced from the siege of Plataea, we have reason to doubt whether Procopius confined himself to adapting merely the words of his models.

A few extracts taken at random may serve to illustrate at once some merits and some defects of Procopius.[1] The first is his account of how Orestes, the barbarian who was "boss" in Italy during the reign of his son, Romulus Augustulus, was overthrown in 476 by another barbarian "boss," the Rugian, Odovacar, who in turn was later to succumb to the Ostrogoths under Theodoric; and it should be remembered that Procopius wrote this seventy years after the events had happened:

While Zeno was reigning at Byzantium, the power in the west was held by the Augustus whom the Romans nicknamed Augustulus because he succeeded to the empire in early youth; his father, Orestes, a very prudent man, was regent. Some time previously the Romans had received as allies the Skyri and Alani and other Gothic [German] tribes, after the defeats they had suffered from Alaric and Attila, of whom I have written in former books. The fame of the Roman soldiers decreased in proportion as that of the barbarians increased, and under the specious name of "alliance" they fell under the tyrannical sway of the intruders. The impudence of the latter grew to such an extent that after many concessions had willingly been made to their needs, they at length wanted to divide the entire arable land of Italy among themselves. Of this they demanded a third part from Orestes, and when he refused them they straightway slew him. Among the barbarians was a certain imperial guardsman, Odovacar by name, who then promised them the fulfilment of their desires if they would appoint him to the command. After he

[1] The translations follow closely those of Hodgkin (in *Italy and her Invaders*), who has preserved much of the charm of the author's style with small sacrifice of literal meaning.

had thus usurped the rule, he did no other injury to the emperor but allowed him to live as a private citizen. To the barbarians he handed over the third of all arable land, by which act he assured their devotion to himself; and he held his usurped power ten years.

Procopius gives the following account of how Theodoric was sent into Italy, which differs in certain respects from the account by Jordanes:

Emperor Zeno, a man skilful in expedient of a temperate kind, exhorted Theodoric to march into Italy, and entering the lists against Odovacar, to win the western rule for himself and the Goths. He showed him that it was better for him, now especially that he had attained the dignity of Senator, by the overthrow of a tyrant to obtain the rule over all the Romans and Italians than, by continuing the struggle with the emperor, to run so many risks as he must do. Theodoric then, being pleased with the bargain, departed for Italy. . . .

The differences between the emperor and the Goths after the death of Theodoric are summed up in reports of the negotiations of Gothic envoys with Belisarius:

The Gothic envoys to Belisarius: "We complain of you, O Romans, that you have taken up arms without cause against an allied and friendly people, and we shall prove our complaint by facts which no man can gainsay. The Goths came into possession of this land not by violently wresting it from the Romans, but by taking it from Odovacar, who having overturned the emperor of that day, changed the polity which existed here into a tyranny. Now Zeno who was then emperor in the east was desirous to avenge his colleague on the usurper and to free the country, but was not strong enough to cope with the forces of Odovacar. He therefore persuaded our ruler Theodoric, who was at that very time meditating

the siege of Byzantium, to forego his hostility to the empire in remembrance of the dignities which he had already received in the Roman state, those namely of Patrician and Consul, to avenge upon Odovacar his injustice to Augustulus, and to confer upon this country and his own people the blessings of a just and stable government. Thus then did our nation come to be guardians of this land of Italy. The settled order of things which we found here we preserved, nor can any man point to any new law, written or unwritten, and say 'That was introduced by Theodoric.' As for religious affairs, so anxiously have we guarded the liberty of the Romans that there is no instance of one of them having voluntarily or under compulsion adopted our creed, while there are many instances of Goths who have gone over to yours, not one of whom has suffered any punishment. The holy places of the Romans have received the highest honor from us, and their right of sanctuary has been uniformly respected. The high offices of the state have always been held by Romans, not once by a Goth. We challenge contradiction if any of our statements are incorrect. Then too, the Romans have been permitted to receive a Consul every year, on the nomination of the emperor in the east.

"To sum up. You did nothing to help Italy when, not for a few months but for ten long years, she was groaning under the oppression of Odovacar and his barbarians; but now you are putting forth all your strength upon no valid pretext against her rightful occupants. We call upon you therefore to depart hence, to enjoy in quiet your own possessions and the plunder which during this war you have collected in our country."

Belisarius to the Gothic envoys: "You promised that you would speak briefly and with moderation, but you have given us a long harangue, full of something very like bragging. Emperor Zeno sent Theodoric to make war upon Odovacar, not in order that he himself should obtain the kingship of Italy (for what would have been the advantage of replacing one

tyrant by another?), but that the country might be restored to freedom and its obedience to the emperor. Now all that Theodoric did against the usurper was well done, but his later behavior, in refusing to restore the country to its rightful lord, was outrageously ungrateful; nor can I see any difference between the conduct of a man who originally lays hands on another's property, and his who, when such a stolen treasure comes into his possession, refuses to restore it to its true owner. Never, therefore, will I surrender the emperor's land to any other lord. But if you have any other request to make, speak on." [1]

Procopius displays marked impartiality toward the Goths, for whom he often expresses sincere admiration. His estimate of Theodoric does him particular credit:

Theodoric was an extraordinary lover of justice, and adhered rigorously to the laws. He guarded the country from barbarian invasion, and displayed both intelligence and prudence in the highest degree. Of injustice towards his subjects there was hardly a trace in his government, nor would he allow any of his subordinates to attempt anything of the kind, save only that the Goths divided among themselves the same proportion of the land of Italy which Odovacar had given to his partisans. So then Theodoric was in name a tyrant, but in deed a true king, not inferior to the best of his predecessors, and his popularity grew greatly, contrary to the ordinary fashion of human affairs, both among Goths and Italians. For generally, as different classes in the state want different things, the government which pleases one party, has to incur the odium of those who do not belong to it.

After a reign of thirty-seven years he died, having been a terror to all his enemies, and left a deep regret for his loss in the hearts of his subjects.[2]

[1] vi. 6. [2] v, 1.

On Belisarius and the differences between his army and that of the Goths:

In public the Romans naturally expressed their wonder at the genius of Belisarius which had achieved such a victory, but in private life his friends inquired of him what was the token which, in the first day of successful engagement with the enemy, had led him to conclude that in this war he should be uniformly victorious. Then he told them that, at the beginning, when the engagement had been limited to a few men on each side, he had studied what were the characteristic differences of each army, in order that when the battles commenced on a larger scale he might not see his small army overwhelmed by sheer force of numbers. The chief difference which he noted was that all the Romans and their Hunnish allies were good archers on horseback. The Goths, on the other hand, had none of them practised this art. Their cavalry fought only with javelins and swords, and their archers were drawn up for battle as infantry, and covered by the cavalry. Thus the horsemen, unless the battle became a hand-to-hand encounter, having no means of replying to a discharge of weapons from a distance, were easily thrown into confusion and cut to pieces, while the foot-soldiers, though able to reply to a volley of arrows from a distance, could not stand against sudden charges of horse. For this reason Belisarius maintained that the Goths in their encounters would always be worsted by the Romans.

Procopius supplies many suggestive facts about the Vandal kingdom in Africa. He says of Genseric:

If he saw any man among the provincials of Africa flourishing in reputation and wealth, he gave him, with his lands and other possessions, to his sons Huneric and Genzo, as servile property. From the other Africans he took away the largest

and best part of their lands, and distributed them among the nation of the Vandals; and from that time these lands are called the Vandal Allotments unto this day. The former possessors of these lands were for the most part left poor and free—at liberty, that is, to take themselves off whither they would. Now all these estates which Genseric had bestowed upon his sons and the other Vandals were, according to his orders, free from the payment of all taxes. But all the land which seemed to him to be of poorer quality, he left in the hands of the former owners, so burdened however with taxes and public charges that nothing beyond a bare subsistence could be reaped by the nominal possessors. Many of these tried to flee, but were arrested and put to death; for sundry grievous crimes were laid to their charge, the greatest of all, according to his estimate, being the attempted concealment of treasure. Thus did the African provincials fall into every kind of misery.

Genseric arranged the Vandals and Alani into regiments over whom he set no fewer than eighty colonels, whom he called Chiliarchs (captains of thousands), so creating the belief that his forces amounted to eighty thousand men. Nevertheless the number of the Vandals and Alani was said in time before the invasion not to amount to more than fifty thousand; but the natural increase of the population, together with their practice of admitting other barbarians into their confederation, had enormously added to their numbers. The names, however, of the Alani, and of every other barbarian tribe in the confederacy except the Moors, were all merged in the one designation of Vandals.[1]

The Germans seem to have retained their physical characteristics of earlier centuries:

The greatest names of this confraternity of nations are Goth and Vandal and Visigoth and Gepid. They all have fair skins

[1] iii, 5.

and yellow hair; they are tall of stature and goodly to look upon. They all possess the same laws, the same faith, Arian Christianity; and the same language, the Gothic. To me they appear all to have formed part of one nation in old time, and afterwards to have been distinguished from each other by the names of their leaders.

In the midst of the narrative of the Vandal and Gothic campaigns, Procopius inserts interesting and often valuable digressions on other barbarian affairs:

The Franks, seeing the mischief which Goths and Romans were inflicting on one another, and the length to which the war was being protracted, began to take it very ill that they should obtain no advantage from the calamities of a country of which they were such near neighbors. Forgetting, therefore, the oaths which they had sworn and the covenants which they had ratified only a short time before with both kingdoms —for this nation is the most slippery of all mankind in its observance of its plighted word—they marched into Italy to the number of one hundred thousand men under the guidance of their king, Theudebert. A few horsemen armed with spears surrounded the person of their king: all the rest fought on foot, having neither bow nor spear, but each with a sword and shield and one axe. The iron of this axe is stout, sharp, and two-edged; the handle, made of wood, is exceedingly short. At a given signal they all throw these axes, and thus at the first onset are wont to break the shields of the enemy and slay his men.

Another good example of his useful insertions is the address of the Gepidae to Justinian:

We admit, Sire, that he who proposes to a neighbor that he should form an alliance with him, is bound to show that such an alliance is just and expedient. That we shall have no difficulty in proving in the present instance. The alliance

is a just one, for we have been of old the *foederati* of the Romans, while the Lombards have only of late become friendly to the empire. Moreover, we have constantly endeavored to settle our differences with them by arbitration; but this, in their braggart insolence, they have always refused till now, when perceiving that we are in earnest and recognizing their weakness they come whining to you for succor. And the alliance with us will be an expedient one, for any one who is acquainted with the subject knows that in numbers and martial spirit the Gepidae far surpass the Lombards. If you choose our alliance on this occasion, grateful for your present succor, we shall follow your standard against every other foe, and the abundance of our strength will insure you victory.

But then these robbers pretend that Sirmium and certain other parts of Dacia are a sufficient cause of war between us and you. On the contrary, there is such a superabundance of cities and territory in your great empire, that you have rather to look out for men on whom to bestow a portion of them. To the Franks, to the Heruli, and even to these very Lombards, you have given such store of cities and fields as no man can number. Relying in full confidence on your friendship, we anticipated your intentions. When a man has made up his mind to part with a certain possession, how much more highly does he value the friend who reads his thought and helps himself to the intended gift (always supposing there is nothing insulting in his way of doing it), than him who passively receives his favor. Now the former is exactly the position which the Gepidae have occupied towards the Romans.

Lay these things to heart we entreat you. If it be possible, which we earnestly desire, join us with your whole force against the Lombards. But if that be not possible, stand aside and leave us to fight out our own quarrels.[1]

[1] vii, 34.

CHAPTER XV

Sources from Justinian to Pippin

The sources for the period from 400 to 550 narrate, with numerous contradictions and few details, the gradual sloughing-off of the western provinces of the Roman empire and the beginnings of barbarian "kingdoms." Yet on careful study of these sources it is difficult to see just how the invasions of the century and a half differed from earlier ones which had left the Roman administration and law quite intact. We still read of German fighting German, of the barbarian "boss," of the empire and its majesty, of marauding expeditions, of *coloni* and *foederati*, and if not of conflicts between Christian and pagan, at least of the strife of Arian and Catholic. But somehow the Germanic invasions have increased greatly during this period in numbers, in extent, in staying power, and in political influence.

The sources which treat of the period from 550 to 750 are probably as great in bulk as those of the two preceding centuries, but they are less satisfactory. They dealt with a time when Germans had become commonplace,—the barbarians were then settling extensively and permanently in the western provinces,—and doubtless the writers considered unnecessary any detailed description of the German states or of the fusion of the newcomers with the Roman citizens. By far the most numerous of these sources, moreover, are saints' lives, which were certainly prepared to supply other needs than the comparative study of politics or agrarian re-

search. The mass of saints' lives are suggestive of the times and are useful, but their number excludes them from consideration in a review of this kind. Even the few best known narratives of the late sixth, seventh, and early eighth centuries, which can be specifically mentioned,[1] are mainly concerned with religion, with petty gossip of the courts of the German "kings," and with earthquakes; they give only occasional indirect hints as to the social, economic and intellectual life of the time, and even military events, to be recorded, must be accompanied by miracle or portent. All these sources are partisan in the direction of great Catholic piety. Written almost without exception by churchmen, they reflect religious zeal and glow with fervor. Paganism dies, and there are no more pagan sources. Arianism is killed, and we have no Arian sources. What learning lives on, is a monopoly of Catholic clergy, and we must remember that as a rule one class can hardly convey an accurate impression of all the people who go to make up complex society. If no one at the present time could write English except lawyers, what picture would our descendants have of our shoemakers, janitors, sisters of charity, railroad men, surveyors, hewers of stone, diggers of ditch, clerks and errand boys? The writers of the period from Justinian to Pippin are of one mind: love of God, hatred of heretics, veneration of saints, praise of rulers who favored the church or themselves, curses on those who opposed holy church, wonder at the marvellous interventions of God, indifference toward mere man. They make the catholic Roman church of far greater importance than the universal

[1] Practically every source of the period becomes a source for the Germans, and the great modern guides—Potthast, Ebert, Wattenbach, Gross and Molinier—are available. The last-named gives especially detailed lists of saints' lives relating to the history of Gaul and the Franks (vol. i).

Roman empire, although in that respect as in others they may bespeak but an exaggerated opinion of their own calling and their own position. We should be on our guard against overestimating what they plainly overestimated. Possibly if other classes of men had left their records, we should not view the period as one of unparalleled faith.

The period was more plausibly one of unparalleled ignorance. The sources of the seventh and eighth centuries, considered as a whole, reach the lowest degradation. Scanty, obscure, illiterate, and often anonymous, they reflect the intellectual poverty of the age. They are impressive witnesses to a change which Germanic immigration and invasion had effected, more momentous than the lapse of political institutions or even the transition of social conditions. That change was a marked decline in culture and civilization.

The most destructive Germans are said to have been the Angles and Saxons in Britain and the Lombards in Italy. It appears that the Roman military organization in Britain was weakened by numerous civil wars resulting from attempts of provincial governors to usurp imperial power [1] and by ravages of Picts and Scots from the north. The Roman legions were permanently withdrawn from Britain early in the fifth century, and the civil government may have vanished with the military occupation. Then came the Angles and Saxons, and a conflict seems to have been inaugurated about the middle of the fifth century which lasted more than a hundred years and resulted in the establishment of several Germanic kingdoms. It is alleged that

[1] See E. A. Freeman, *Western Europe in the Fifth Century* (London, 1904), which includes the substance of two articles published in the *English Historical Review* in 1886 and 1887. The most recent account of the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain is that of H. M. Chadwick, *The Origin of the English Nation* (Cambridge, 1907).

in the British provinces there was more strictly speaking a war of conquest waged by the Germans, attended by a more complete breakdown of Roman customs and institutions, than was the case in other provinces. But the sources relating to the loss of Britain are exceedingly scanty.

Practically the only contemporary narrative about the invasions of the Angles and Saxons is the curious collection of the monk Gildas (*cca.* 516-573), who pictures in extravagant colors the sufferings of his native country subsequent to the landing of the Germans. His work, entitled *Liber querolus de calamitate, excidio et conquestu Britanniae*,[1] is divided into two parts: the first (*Historia*) contains in twenty-six chapters not a straightforward historical narrative but merely rhetorical declamations on supposedly historical episodes; the second part (*Epistola*) consists of bombastic reproaches directed against clergy and the "kings" of the country,—Constantine, Aurelius Conanus, Vortigern, Cuneglassus, Maglocunus, etc. The tone is violent throughout, and the diction is sometimes almost unintelligible, owing to the long and entangled sentences.

In Italy, barbarian incursions recommenced shortly after the final destruction of Ostrogothic rule in 553. The Lombards who had settled in Pannonia after the Goths left and had repeatedly served the Roman emperor, were now able on the death of Justinian in 568 to establish themselves firmly in northern Italy and extend their influence throughout the interior of the peninsula to Beneventum. The Lom-

[1] Or *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae ac flebili castigatione in reges, principes et sacerdotes epistola.* Edited by Petrie in *Monumenta historica britannica,* vol. i (London, 1848); by A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs in *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain,* vol. i (Oxford, 1869); and by T. Mommsen in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. xiii (Berlin, 1898). English translation by J. A. Giles in the *Bohn Antiquarian Library,* vol. iv (London, 1848).

bard kingdom lasted throughout the seventh century and the first half of the eighth, and seems to have been quite different from earlier barbarian settlements in Italy. As nearly as we can gather from the sources, its kings were not eager for office under the empire, as Alaric, Odovacar and Theodoric had been; they conquered the country as did the Angles and Saxons in Britain; they destroyed Roman administration and substituted their own law for that of the commonwealth. But the sources relating to the Lombards are fragmentary and unsatisfactory. They are chiefly papal letters, especially those of Gregory the Great (*cca.* 540-604), the Lombard laws (*cca.* 643), and, considerably later, the Lombard history of Paul the Deacon.[1]

The damning heresy of the Lombards and their ambition to possess all Italy evoked the tears and protests of the pontiffs.[2] A letter of Pelagius II to the bishop of Auxerre, which was probably written in 581, is typical:

Not without some great purpose has it been ordained by Divine Providence that your [Frankish] kings should share with the

[1] On the Lombard laws, see *infra,* pp. 214-8. About the year 670 an unknown writer prefixed to the code a prologue on the origin of the Lombards, which is purely legendary. This *Origo Langobardorum* is edited by G. Waitz in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum,* pp. 1-6 (Hanover, 1878). On Paul the Deacon, see *infra,* p. 193.

[2] The letters of Gregory the Great and other popes up to Innocent III, published in part in the *Patrologia latina* of Migne, have been analyzed by Ph. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* new edition much enlarged by Wattenbach, Kaltenbrunner and Ewald, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885-1888). For Gregory's writings, see A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande,* also translated into French (Paris, 1884); and F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great, his place in History and Thought,* 2 vols. (London, 1905). The *Liber pontificalis* of the Roman bishops furnishes a few details on the Germanic movements, edited by L. Duchesne, 2 vols. (Paris, 1884, 1893). A new edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* was begun by T. Mommsen in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* (Berlin, 1898).

Roman empire in the confession of the orthodox faith. Assuredly this was brought to pass in order that they might be, so-to-speak, neighbors and helpers of this city of Rome, whence that confession took its birth, and of the whole of Italy. Beware, then, dearest brother, lest through levity of purpose your kings should fail in their high mission. . . . Persuade them as earnestly as you can to keep themselves from all friendship and alliance with our most unspeakable enemies, the Lombards, lest when the day of vengeance dawns (which we trust in the Divine mercy it will do speedily), your kings should share in the Lombards' punishment . . .[1]

Gregory's letters are an especially important historical source if used critically.[2] Some of his saints' lives have interesting details, but in the main they are mere collections of quaint, fantastic tales.[3] His most recent biographer says[4] of him:

[1] *Ad Aunacharium,* ed. Migne, *Patrol. lat.,* vol. lxxii, p. 706.

[2] Gregory the Great (d. 604). His 844 letters, divided into 12 books, are edited by Migne, *Patrol. lat.,* vol. lxxvii, pp. 441-1328. There is an old German translation by M. Feyerabend (Kempten, 1807-9). See P. Ewald, *Studien zur Ausgabe des Registers Gregors I* (Hanover, 1878). A new edition of Gregory's Letters was begun by P. Ewald, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae,* vol. i (Berlin, 1887) and carried on by L. M. Hartmann, *ibid.,* vol. ii (Berlin, 1893).

[3] The weird tale of casting Theodoric into the crater of Lipari is related in the *Dialogues,* iv, 30. Gregory saw the barbarians less than God's judgment. He writes in his biography of Benedict of a conversation between the saint and a certain visiting priest (ch. 15): "When they were talking concerning the entry of King Totila and the destruction of the city of Rome, the priest said, 'The city will be destroyed by that king so that it shall be inhabited no more.' To whom the man of God made answer, 'Rome shall not be overthrown by the tribes, but, wearied with tempests, lightnings, whirlwinds and earthquakes, it shall consume away by itself.' The meaning of the prophecy is now made clearer than daylight to us, who see in the city, walls shattered, houses thrown down, churches destroyed by the whirlwind, and great edifices, loosened by long old age, falling around us in abounding ruin." Ed. Migne, *Patrol. lat.,* vol. lxvi, p. 162.

[4] F. H. Dudden, *op. cit.,* vol. i, p. 356.

It is certainly astonishing that the clear-headed man who managed the papal estates and governed the Church with such admirable skill, should have contributed to the propagation of these wild tales of demons and wizards and haunted houses, of souls made visible, of rivers obedient to written orders, of corpses that scream and walk. And yet such was the fact. The landlord of the Papal Patrimonies and the author of the *Dialogues* are one and the same person. And in him we have, perhaps, the first genuine Italian example of the mediaeval intellect.

About the time of Gregory's death, Secundus, bishop of Trent, wrote a history of the Lombards which seems to have been valuable, but is now lost to us save a few extracts preserved by Paul the Deacon.

The principal source relating to the Franks in the sixth century is the history of Gregory of Tours. He was born at Clermont in Auvergne between 539 and 543, the son of a provincial senator. What education he had, he secured under an uncle who was bishop of Clermont. Gregory took holy orders and was received at the Austrasian court. His reputation for piety and wisdom secured him in 573 the bishopric of Tours. He continued to take an active interest in Frankish politics, although he incurred the bitter enmity of Queen Fredegond. He died at Tours in November, 594. He left a treatise on miracles, which, except for a few statements about Martin of Tours, has no historical interest; and the celebrated *Historia Francorum* [1] in ten books.

[1] Edited by W. Arndt in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum,* vol. i (Hanover, 1885); and by H. Omont and G. Collon in *Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire,* vols. ii, xvii (Paris, 1887, 1894). There is a French translation by Guizot, revised by A. Jacobs (Paris, 1863), and a German translation by W. Giesebrecht in the *Geschichtschreiber.* See G. Kurth, *Clovis,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1901).

The first book, concluding with the death of Martin of Tours in 397, is an absurd and confused résumé of ancient history, which would be as lacking in interest as in chronological exactness did it not contain some details about the establishment of Christianity in Gaul, details of little value as historical events but which picture naively, and sometimes with charm, the condition of mind and manners in his own day; few anecdotes are more poetic or touching than the legend of the Two Lovers. The second book extends from 397 to the death of Clovis (511); the third to the death of Theodebert, king of Austrasia (547); the fourth to the death of Sigebert (575); the fifth book comprises the first five years of the reign of Childebert of Austrasia (575-580); the sixth comes down to the death of Chilperic in 584; the seventh treats of the year 585; the eighth extends to the death of Leuvigild, king of Spain, in 586; the ninth to 589; the tenth stops in August, 591. Thus the work covers from the death of Saint Martin a period of one hundred and seventy-four years, of the last fifty of which the writer was a contemporary.

The history is written in very bad Latin.[1] Gregory's prefatory apology is not too modest:

The culture of letters and of the liberal arts departing, perishing even in the cities of Gaul, in the midst of good and evil acts committed here while the barbarians surrendered themselves to their ferocity and the kings to their fury; while the churches were attacked by heretics and defended by Catholics; while the Christian faith, fervent in many hearts, was cold in others; while the churches were in turn enriched by pious men and despoiled by infidels, no grammarian skilled in the

[1] But see M. A. Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890), and B. Krusch, "Zu M. Bonnets Untersuchungen über Gregor von Tours" in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichte*, vol. xvi (1891).

art of dialectic has undertaken to write down these things in prose or in verse. Thus many men groan and say "Woe to our days! the study of letters perishes among us, and no one is found who can recount in his writings the deeds of the present." Seeing which, I have judged it meet to preserve, albeit in rustic language, the memory of past things so that they may be known to posterity.

I have been unable to pass in silence the broils of evildoers or the life of good people. I have above all been stimulated by what I have often heard told my contemporaries, that few men understand a philosophical rhetorician, although the word of a simple unpretentious man is understood by a great number. . . .

And now, on the point of writing about the conflict of kings with hostile nations, of martyrs with pagans, and of the churches with heretics, I first want to profess my faith, that he who reads may not doubt me to be a Catholic.

Another reason, the opinion of those who are troubled about the approaching end of the world, determines me to collect from the chronicles and histories the number of years already passed in order that we may know clearly how many have gone by since the beginning of the world. But first I shall beg the indulgence of readers if either in style or in words I violate grammatical rules in which I am not very well instructed. I have applied myself solely to absorbing with simplicity and without questioning the faith which the Church teaches, for I know that man, subject to sins, can through simple faith obtain pardon from God.

In spite of the very bad Latin, the history is very useful. Gregory's prominent place at court and his episcopal office at Tours, whither thousands of pilgrims flocked to revere the shrine of Saint Martin, afforded him excellent opportunities to talk with prominent men and familiarize himself with public affairs. Moreover, he must have had personal knowledge of many things which he narrates, for the last eight books are really a history of his own time.

The major portion of the narrative treats of ecclesiastical squabbles, dogma and heresy. The minor part relates court deeds and gossip. The narrative is not continuous throughout, but is interrupted by frequent digressions, anecdotes, sermons and occasionally an illuminating description. The whole is presented, however, with such manifest candor and frankness and directness as to convince the reader of the author's sincerity of purpose. It is obvious that Gregory tried to be truthful.

The work suggests many ideas to us about the manner in which the barbarians adapted Roman customs and civilization. This Gregory of Tours, who writes nearly a century after Clovis, is himself of a noble Gallo-Roman family; speaks always respectfully of the empire; talks glibly of senators, patricians and tribunes; seldom seems aware that social or political institutions have undergone any change whatsoever since the advent of the barbarians. On the other hand, Gregory is a zealous Christian bishop: in his work, there is to be found an intense interest in miracles and a fondness for allegory; there is confusion of ecclesiastical and political interests, with symptoms of friction and ultimately of ecclesiastical triumph; there are evidences of feudal society; there is the growth of ascetic ideals and monasticism; there is the ultra-devotion to Catholicism, horror of heresy, prejudice against the Jews, crusades in the interest of religion, respect for the Roman see. Gregory is an interesting product of his time, at once a Roman and a mediaeval churchman.

In every book there are four or five sections devoted to earthquakes, pestilences, floods and prodigies. Miracles and prophecies and the casting-out of devils are recorded as everyday occurrences. The following is an example of Gregory's taste and of his familiar style:

After the synod of which I have spoken, I had already bade the king farewell and was preparing to return home; but not wanting to go without having said goodby to Salvius [bishop of Albi] and embraced him, I went to look for him, and found him at the house of Brinnacius; I told him I was going home, and walking aside to chat a bit, he said to me, "Do you not see above this roof what I perceive?" "I see," I replied, "a second little structure which the king has lately built there." And he said, "Don't you see something else?" "I see nothing else," said I; and thinking that he spoke thus in jest, I added, "If you see something else, tell me." And he, heaving a deep sigh, said to me "I see the sword of divine anger drawn and suspended over this house." And the words of the bishop were true, for twenty days afterwards, the king, as we have said, lost his two sons.[1]

There are more references in the *Historia Francorum* to social conditions than in most of the sources which we have reviewed. Two bishops are mentioned who came out to fight the Lombards, "armed not with the heavenly cross but with secular armor, and they killed many with their own hands."[2] The taxes of Chilperic were so heavy that many people had to leave the country; riots resulted, and in Limousin the tax-rolls were burned.[3] ". . . One day the bishop assembled his laborers in a field which they were to work for him . . ."[4] A Gallo-Roman, nephew of the bishop of Langres, was held in serfdom as a hostage by a barbarian who lived near Trier.[5] King Gontram inflicted the death penalty on one of his officials who killed a buffalo in the forest preserves, but Gregory remarks that it was really a little offence and that the king regretted the severity of the punishment.[6] There is a charming picture of the town of Dijon:[7]

[1] v, 50. [2] iv, 42. [3] v, 28. [4] vi, 36.
[5] iii, 15. [6] x, 10. [7] iii, 19.

It is a town hemmed in by very solid walls, in the middle of a smiling plain whose land is so fertile that sowing can be done without ploughing; to the south is the river Ouche, full of fish; there comes from the north another little stream which enters through a gate, passes under a bridge, goes out by another gate, and surrounds the ramparts with its quiet flow. Before the gate it turns several mills with great rapidity. Dijon has four gates, located at the four cardinal points; the entire structure is adorned with twenty-three towers, and the walls are built of block stone to a height of twenty feet and of small stones higher still. In all they are thirty feet high and fifteen feet thick. I do not know why this place is not called a city; it has in its territory abundant resources; to the west are very fertile hills, covered with vines which supply the inhabitants such noble Falernian that they despise the wine of Châlons. The ancients say this town was built by Emperor Aurelian.

A suggestion of the education of the time is furnished by a statement [1] concerning the servant of a senator, who

went with his master to serve him and applying himself to the study of letters he became celebrated on account of his education, for he was perfectly instructed in the works of Virgil, in the laws of the Theodosian Code, and in the science of mathematics.

Sidelights on Gallic history of the sixth century are supplied by a genial abbé, who loved song and the society of fair women. Venantius Fortunatus (*fl.* 535-600) was a native of Treviso in northeastern Italy and studied at Ravenna, but spent the major portion of his life in travel. He toured the Alpine region and southern Germany, traversed Gaul as far as the Pyrenees, and even wrote songs

[1] iv, 46.

from Britain. He visited Tours, thanks, as he says himself, to the miraculous guidance of Saint Martin, and there was graciously received by Bishop Gregory. His long wanderings were at length brought to a close by the charming widow of the Frankish king, Clotaire I (d. 561), who was presiding over a convent which she had founded at Poitiers. To her Fortunatus addressed passionate poems; and after her death he wrote her biography and continued to send passionate poems to her daughter. He became a priest and Paul the Deacon affirms [1] that he was bishop of Poitiers. Fortunatus was a worldly man, a parlor parson, quite as much concerned with dainty dishes prepared for him by the sisters [2] as with the salvation of souls; and he was doubtless a social lion at Poitiers. His saints' lives are rather happily written; they suggest the times perhaps better than lives written by churchmen who were more obviously pious and austere. His eleven books of poems [3] are of some historical interest because they often treat of historical subjects. The first three relate to ecclesiastical matters and persons; the fourth comprises epitaphs on some men and many ladies; the fifth is addressed to bishops; the sixth to kings, queens, and princesses; the seventh to courtiers; the last four to various people. Fortunatus had a decided talent for writing verses. The Germans had not blotted out all learning and all cleverness.

The intellectual life of the west in the seventh century seems to have been greatest in Ireland and in Spain. The former was not greatly affected by the Germanic invasions,

[1] *Historia Langobardorum,* ii, 13.

[2] xi, 9, 10.

[3] His complete works are in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. iv, the poems edited by F. Leo and the prose works by B. Krusch (Berlin, 1881, 1885). French translation by C. Nisard (Paris, 1887). See C. Nisard, *Le poète Fortunat* (Paris, 1890).

but the latter, as the seat of the Visigothic kingdom, is important for our purposes. Several names indicate that culture was not dead in Spain: the bishops Eugenius and Julian [1] of Toledo, and Marcus Maximus [2] and Braulio [3] of Saragossa. The Visigothic king Sisebutus (612-621) left sixty-one correct hexameters on eclipses of the sun and moon, in addition to interesting and useful letters.[4] But the greatest of the Spanish writers was Isidore of Seville (*cca.* 570-636), not because he was very learned or possessed remarkable acumen, but because he wrote very extensively and became one of the most influential teachers of the middle age. In addition to his fantastic pseudo-scientific *Etymologies* and *De natura rerum*, he prepared a slight chronicle, which continued those of Eusebius, Jerome, and Victor Tonnennensis down to 615. It is divided, in imitation of Saint Augustine, according to the six ages of the world symbolized by the six days of creation, and contains invaluable notes for the history of Spain subsequent to Orosius.[5] Isidore completed probably in the year of the death of King Sisebutus a short history of Goths, Vandals, and Sueves, which is more important than the chronicle,

[1] Julian's history of the expedition of King Wamba against a rebellious duke of Narbonne is in Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vol. xcvi, pp. 763-808. For the writings of Eugenius, see Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vol. lxxxvii.

[2] Marcus Maximus (d. 619) wrote part of a chronicle extending from 468 to 644. Edited in Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vol. lxxx.

[3] Forty-four letters of Braulio (d. 651) are edited by M. Risco in Florez, *España sagrada*, vol. xxx. See P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, vol. ii, pp. 146-149 (Regensburg, 1874).

[4] The letters of Sisebutus are in Florez, *España sagrada*, vol. vii; and in Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vol. lxxx.

[5] See A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande* (Leipzig, 1889), vol. i, pp. 518-542. The chronicle is extant in two versions, varying slightly in length and detail. The complete works of Isidore are in Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vols. lxxxi-lxxxiv.

and about five years later issued a second revised edition, enlarged by the addition of Biblical quotations and orthodox outpourings.[1] Isidore's continuation of Gennadius's "Lives of Illustrious Men" was itself continued by his pupil Ildefonsus (d. 667), bishop of Toledo.[2]

The best known sources of the late seventh and early eighth centuries, relating to the Germans, are the Venerable Bede for Britain, the pseudo-Fredegarius and the *Gesta regum Francorum* for Gaul, and for Italy Paul the Deacon.

The Venerable Bede was born in Northumberland in 674, became a priest in 704 and died in 735. He contributed the usual services to saints; prepared a short treatise on chronology, reckoning dates from the birth of Christ; and wrote two works of special interest to us: a chronicle from creation to the year 726, and the highly prized and unique *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, in five books, extending down to 731.[3]

The best contemporary account of Frankish history in the seventh and eighth centuries is a compilation ascribed since the end of the sixteenth century to a certain Fredegarius Scholasticus without any indication in any manuscript or elsewhere to justify such an assumption.[4] Ac-

[1] Both versions of the *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum* are extant.

[2] In Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vol. lxxx. St. Jerome had prepared brief biographical sketches of prominent churchmen, which were brought up to date by the additions and amendments of Gennadius, a priest at Marseilles (*cca.* 495).

[3] The complete works of the Venerable Bede are in Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, vols. xc-xcv. The Ecclesiastical History is edited separately by A. Holder (Freiburg-i-B., 1882). The best edition of the latter is now that of C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896). There is an English translation with accompanying text by T. Miller (London, 1890).

[4] The first editor who, to our knowledge, used the name Fredegarius was Cl. Fauchet (1579) in the *Antiquités gauloises.*

cording to Krusch—the editor of the standard edition of the compilation,[1]—it was begun in 613 by an author who lived in Switzerland and who joined together the annals of Hippolytus,[2] Jerome and Idatius, and wrote the first forty-two chapters of the new work; a second author added in 642 an abridgment of Gregory of Tours and continued the chronicle to the year 642 (sections 43-90); finally, a third author about 660 interpolated several sections. This hypothesis is rejected by Schnürer,[3] who attributes the independent chronicle to obscure royal secretaries in Burgundy and the rest of the compilation to a certain Agrestius, a friend and later an opponent of St. Eustasius of Luxeuil.

Be that as it may, the chronicle of the pseudo-Fredegarius has value. For the years 554 to 593, it supplements Gregory of Tours; from the end of 593, it is practically our

[1] The Paris MS., the oldest and most complete, dating as it seems from the beginning of the eighth century, contains (1) the *Liber generationis* of Saint Hippolytus; (2) the Chronicle of Saint Jerome; (3) the Chronicle of Idatius (378-468) with some legendary statements about Theodoric, Justinian, etc.; (4) the abridgment of the first six books of the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, known as the *Historia epitoma;* (5) an original chronicle extending from 584 to 642, but containing allusions to events between 652 and 664; (6) the Chronicle of Isidore of Seville from 176 to 628. This Paris MS. was published by G. Monod in part thirty-six of the *Bibliothèque de l'école pratique des hautes études* (Paris, 1885). B. Krusch prepared a critical edition of the compilation together with its continuations in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum,* vol. ii (Hanover, 1888). There is a German translation by O. Abel in the *Geschichtschreiber,* and a French translation by M. Guizot, revised by A. Jacobs, 2 vols. (Paris, 1860).

[2] The *Liber generationis,* bearing the name of Saint Hippolytus, schismatic bishop of Rome (222-235), is an enumeration of names in sacred and profane history and in geography from early times to the reign of Alexander Severus, to which are joined slight chronological data, a list of popes to Adrian I (772), and a short chronicle to the time of Heraclius (610-641) translated from the Greek. It appears as bk. i of the pseudo-Fredegarius in the Krusch edition.

[3] G. Schnürer, *Die Verfasser des sog. Fredegar-Chronik* (Freiburg-i-S., 1900).

only source, together with contemporary biographies of saints, because the continuation of Marius Aventicensis [1] contains only very brief and very dry notes, and the *Gesta regum Francorum*, written in the eighth century, has for the first half of the seventh a character purely legendary. The pseudo-Fredegarius is good on Childebert II and his son; in those passages it is very readable. Two whole chapters from Jonas's life of Saint Columban are transcribed. From 614 to 631, the story is more vague and fragmentary, but from 631 to 642, we have an ample and precise narrative which seems to come from an eye-witness. The author is interested chiefly in the affairs of Austrasia and Burgundy and shows a pronounced hatred of Neustria; he is of mediocre intelligence, writes in the most corrupt Latin imaginable, but inspires confidence by his apparent sincerity.

The chronicle of the pseudo-Fredegarius was continued to the year 768, probably by three different authors. The first, who lived in Austrasia and was a staunch supporter of Pippin's family, carried the work to 736. The second, who gave us the history of the years 737 to 751, wrote by order of Count Childebrand, an uncle of King Pippin. The third continuator, author of the narrative from 752 to 768, belonged to the house of Count Nibelung, son of Childebrand. Thus the anonymous continuations of the pseudo-Fredegarius have the advantages and the defects of official writings: the authors were in an excellent position to be well-informed, but their testimony was bound to be partisan and biased.

The compilation attributed to Fredegarius and its continuations are most useful for Austrasian affairs; the corresponding Neustrian authority is the *Gesta regum Fran-*

[1] See *supra*, p. 150.

corum,[1] written about 725 by a monk of Rouen or of Paris. The *Gesta* include an abridgment of books II-VI of Gregory of Tours, and an independent history of the years 642 to 700. The work was taken into Austrasia very soon after its composition, and another anonymous writer there completed it by adding some notes from Gregory of Tours [2] and Isidore of Seville; it thus supplied the elements for the first continuation of the pseudo-Fredegarius. The Latin is slightly better than that of pseudo-Fredegarius, but the author had practically no sources at his disposal and his narrative, filled with prejudice and preposterous legends, is quite worthless for the period with which its writer is not a contemporary. It is in the *Gesta regum Francorum* that the legend of the Trojan origin of the Franks received its final development; barely outlined by pseudo-Fredegarius, it thenceforth served as a model for many other fanciful reconstructions of antiquity by mediaeval chroniclers.

The facts in the biography of Paul the Deacon are taken from his works. [3] He was a Lombard, called Paulus Warne-

[1] Or *Liber historiae Francorum.* Edited by B. Krusch in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum,* vol. ii (Hanover, 1888). See G. Kurth, "Étude critique sur le Gesta regum Francorum" in *Bulletin de l'académie royale de Belgique,* series iii, vol. xviii (1889).

[2] The whole work sometimes passes under Gregory's name.

[3] The works of Paul the Deacon are edited in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica:* the *Historia Langobardorum* by Bethmann and Waitz in *Scriptores rer. Langob. et Ital.* (Hanover, 1878) and also in the *octavo;* the review of Eutropius, or *Historia miscella,* by Droysen in *Auctores Antiquissimi,* vol. ii, pp. 227-374; the *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* by Pertz in *Scriptores,* vol. ii, pp. 260-268; and the Letters by Dümmler in *Epistolae,* vol. iv, pp. 505-516. There is an English translation of the *Historia Langobardorum* by W. D. Foulke, published by the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1907). There is also a German translation of part of

fridus, and was born about 720. He received a fair education, knew Greek, and lived at court. He wrote a poem in 763 on the six ages of the world, the verses of which form an acrostic on the name of Adelperga Pia, the daughter of the Lombard king, Desiderius. It was for her, also, that Paul enlarged and continued the Roman history of Eutropius. He probably entered the cloister of Montecassino after the fall of the Lombard kingdom. He later crossed the Alps to seek assurance from Charlemagne of his brother's safety. There he was honorably received, and gave instruction in Greek besides writing several homilies and his history of the bishopric of Metz. He wrote subsequently at Montecassino a commentary on the rule of Saint Benedict and his famous History of the Lombards. The last named is the standard authority for Lombard affairs. The sources which he used were the *Origo Langobardorum*, the histories of Secundus of Trent, Gregory of Tours, and the Venerable Bede, the writings of Gregory the Great, and various episcopal lives. In spite of the general clarity and manifest sincerity of the work, it is obviously uncritical. Paul is unable to separate fact from fiction, history from legend, and his account of earlier times is very unreliable.

Paul the Deacon has great respect for the legendary past of the Lombards. He discovers and dwells on the "good old times:"

But when the Lombards had been for ten years under the power of their dukes, at length by common consent they appointed to themselves as king, Anthari, the son of the above-

Paul's works in the *Geschichtschreiber*. The critical studies of Paul the Deacon by Bethmann, Dahn, Mommsen, etc., are analyzed by W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1893).

mentioned Cleph. On account of his dignity they called him Flavius, a forename which all the succeeding Lombards used auspiciously. In his day, on account of the restoration of the kingdom, the then ruling dukes contributed half of all their possessions to the royal exchequer that there might be a fund for the maintenance of the king himself, and of those who were attached to him by the liability to perform the various offices of his household. The subject populations who had been assigned to their several Lombard guests were also included. In truth this was a marvelous fact in the kingdom of the Lombards: there was no evidence, no plots were devised, no one oppressed another by unjust exactions, none despoiled his neighbor; there were no thefts, no robberies with violence; every man went about his business as he pleased, in fearless security.[1]

One other quotation may illustrate Paul's history. It is his interesting mention of the celebrated legal code of King Rothari:

The kingship of the Lombards was assumed by Rothari, by birth an *arodus*. He was a man of strong character and one who followed the path of justice, though he adhered not to the orthodox Christian faith, being stained by the infidelity of the Arian heresy. For in truth the Arians assert to their own great harm and loss that the Son is inferior to the Father and the Holy Ghost inferior to the Father and the Son; but we Catholics confess the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost to be one true God in three persons with equal power and the same glory. At that time in almost all the cities of the realm there were two bishops, one a Catholic, and the other an Arian. In the city of Pavia the place is still shown where the Arian bishop had his baptistery, residing near the basilica of St. Eusebius, while another bishop resided at the Catholic Church. However, the Arian bishop who was in that city,

[1] Bk. iii, ch. 16.

Anastasius by name, being converted to the Catholic faith, afterwards ruled the Church of Christ. This King Rothari arranged in a series of writings the laws of the Lombards, which they were retaining only in memory and by custom, and ordered that the code should be called an Edict. But it was now the seventy-seventh year since the Lombards had come into Italy [really the seventy-sixth], as the same king has testified in the prologue to his Edict.[1]

[1] Bk. iv, ch. 42. From T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. v, pp. 232, 233, and vol. vi, pp. 167, 168.

CHAPTER XVI

Documentary Sources

The sources so far treated have been unofficial personal narratives. Such sources would nowadays be deemed inadequate. They would be considered as only of secondary value, compared with contemporary documents which would officially state accomplished facts. Their statements, in short, would be tested and interpreted by official documents.

The main documentary sources relating to the Germanic invasions are legal. They are contained in the bulk of both the civil and the canon law which has come down to us from the centuries under review. There are several reasons, however, why the official testimony of state or church has not played so conspicuous a part in the histories of that period as corresponding legal documents would do today. In the first place, the documentary sources of the Roman empire have been studied chiefly by lawyers or by historians of law, rather than by students of the Germanic invasions. In the second place, this kind of source was not so well recorded or so diligently preserved in ancient times as it is now; legal literature of any age is not apt to be popular literature in style or subject-matter, — it is not found in many private libraries; and in Roman days there were no printing-presses and no public-spirited representatives of the people to distribute stout volumes of statutes and governmental reports to their agricultural constituents. And finally, the ancient legal sources which have survived, afford the greatest difficulties of interpretation, for they are

burdened with technical words and phrases, padded in many instances with bland piety and platitudes, and they often stand alone, without commentary or explanation of any kind, monuments to us of mystery and doubt.

The proper treatment of the documentary sources relating to the Germanic invasions would require an elaborate, special study, which is beyond the purpose of the present work; we shall here content ourselves with furnishing a bald outline of the principal groups of the law, passing in review the imperial law and its adaptations by the Germans, the barbarian codes, and finally the canon law.

Roman law of the empire [1] was naturally of two kinds: the edicts and rescripts of the supreme legislators, or "statutory law;" and the opinions of famous jurists on those acts, or "common law." The issuance of laws was coetaneous with the commonwealth. And the most celebrated jurisconsults—Salvius Julianus and Pomponius and Gaius and Papinian, the prince of them all, and Paulus and Ulpian and Modestinus — lived during the first three centuries of the Christian era. The Comitia had been deemed unfit for the work of legislation by the time of Tiberius, and by the time of Diocletian (284-305), the senate had lost its functions of law-making. Thus the emperor had eventually become supreme legislator. Under Diocletian was compiled perhaps the first important code of the enactments then in force. It seems to have been a private venture on the part of a certain Gregorius or Gregorianus and to have embraced various imperial constitutions from

[1] Among the guides to the Roman law, see J. Muirhead, *Law of Rome,* 2nd ed. (London, 1899); P. F. Girard, *Manuel élémentaire de droit romain,* 3rd ed. (Paris, 1901), trans. in part as *Short History of Roman Law* by A. H. F. Lefroy and J. H. Cameron (Toronto, 1906); and M. Conrat, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des römischen Rechts im früheren Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1891).

Hadrian to the year 294, divided probably into fifteen or sixteen books and each book into titles. This *Codex Gregorianus* was supplemented in the fourth century by a similar collection of a certain Hermogenianus or Hermogenes, which covered by three different editions, the years 291 to 365. Of these two compilations, only fragments in later codes are extant.[1]

The relation of jurisprudence to the statutory law was finally determined by the "Law of Citations,"[2] which Valentinian III promulgated in 426:

We accord our approval to all the writings of Papinian, Paul, Gaius, Ulpian, and Modestinus, conceding to Gaius the same authority that is enjoyed by Paul, Ulpian, and the rest, and sanctioning the citation of all his works. We ratify also the opinions (*scientiam*) of those earlier writers whose treatises and statements of the law any of the aforesaid five have made use of in their own works,—Scaevola, for example, and Sabinus, and Julian, and Marcellus,—and of all others whom they have been in the habit of quoting as authoritative; provided always, as their antiquity makes them uncertain, that the texts of those earlier jurists are verified by collation of manu-

[1] There are excerpts in the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* (see *infra*); in the *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanorum*, a long fragment of the first book of a work in which a Christian author about the end of the fourth century endeavored to harmonize the laws of Moses and of the Romans; in the Vatican fragments of a practice book which Cardinal Angelo Mai discovered in 1820; and in the *Consultatio veteris cuiusdam iurisconsulti*, part of a collection of answers upon questions of law submitted for opinion of counsel. Many laws in the code of Justinian were probably taken from the Gregorian and Hermogenian without acknowledgment. The extant fragments were edited by G. Haenel, *Corpus iuris Romani anteiustiniani* (Bonn, 1837). The best text is now that of Krüger, Mommsen, and Stundemund, *Collectio librorum iuris anteiustiniani*, vol. iii (Berlin, 1890). Fragments of juristic writings before Hadrian are edited in the Teubner texts by F. P. Bremer, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1896-1901).

[2] In Theodosian Code, i, 4, 3.

scripts. If divergent *dicta* be adduced, that party shall prevail who has the greatest number of authorities on his side; if the number on each side be the same, that one shall prevail which has the support of Papinian; but while he, most excellent of them all, is to be preferred to any other single authority, he must yield to any two. Paul's and Ulpian's notes on his writings, however, as already enacted, are to be disregarded. Where opinions are equal and none entitled to preference, we leave it to the discretion of the judge which he shall adopt. We also order that Paul's sentences shall always be held authoritative.

Three years after the publication of the "Law of Citations," Theodosius II appointed a commission of nine members to supervise a complete and official codification of the law, but for some unknown reason the work was not accomplished by them. A new committee of sixteen members, which was named in 435, was not more successful with the codification of the opinions of the jurists, but their statutory code was ratified and published in 438 by Theodosius II and Valentinian III:

The felicity of the eternal emperors proceeds so far as to adorn with the ornaments of peace those whom it defends by warfare. Last year when we loyally attended the celebration of the most fortunate of all ceremonies and when the marriage [between Valentinian and Eudoxia] had been happily concluded, the most sacred prince, our lord Theodosius, was fain to add this dignity also to his world, and ordered the precepts of the law to be collected and drawn up in a compendious form of sixteen books, which he wished to be consecrated by his most sacred name. Which thing the eternal prince, our lord Valentinian, approved with the loyalty of a colleague and the affection of a son.

Each of the sixteen books of this Theodosian Code[1] is

[1] The edition of J. Godefroy (ed. Ritter, 7 vols., *folio*, 1736-1745), imperfect as to text, is still useful by reason of the valuable commentary. The standard text is now that of T. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer (Berlin, 1905).

divided into titles, and each title presents the imperial constitutions in chronological order. The first five books, which were known up to the nineteenth century only by extracts in the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*,[1] contain the private law; books six to eight, the new law on the administration of the state; the ninth book, criminal law; the tenth and eleventh, fiscal law; the twelfth to fifteenth inclusive, treat of the organization and administration of communities; and the sixteenth, of the Catholic faith and the universal church.

Imperial edicts subsequent to the promulgation of the Theodosian Code were called "novels" (*Novellae leges* or *constitutiones*). They were issued by various emperors,—Theodosius II, Marcian, Leo, Anthimus, Maximus, Majorian, Severus, and others.[2]

Justinian resolved on his accession to power (527) to carry out fully what Theodosius II had originally planned and to codify not only all the imperial enactments (*leges*) but also the scattered legal opinions and official decisions of binding force (*ius*). He at once appointed a commission, of which the chief member was the celebrated Tribonian. Work was begun with the *leges* in 528, and in 529 the Code was completed. The task was more difficult in the case of the *ius*, and Justinian had to bridge gaps and settle many disputes before a harmonious digest of legal decisions could be arranged.[3] The *Digesta*, or Pandects, as they

[1] See *infra*. The first five books of the Theodosian Code are still incomplete.

[2] The extant *Novellae* issued after the code of Theodosius and prior to that of Justinian are to be found in the latter or in the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* or in separate manuscripts. They have been collected and published as an appendix to the edition of the Theodosian Code of G. Haenel (Bonn, 1842).

[3] These decisions of Justinian were handed down between 529 and 532, and are usually called the *Quinquaginta Decisiones*. "Nostras constitutiones, per quas, suggerente nobis Triboniano, . . . antiqui iuris altercationes placavimus" (*Institutes*, i, 5, 3).

are often called, were at length finished toward the close of 533 and went into force the following year, along with a second revised edition of the Code,[1] which had been issued in order to bring it into accord with Justinian's recent decisions incorporated in the Digest.

The Code and the Digest, together with the later supplementary edicts of Justinian—the Novels—and the admirable introductory text-books—the Institutes—comprise the *Corpus iuris civilis*,[2] or bulk of Roman civil law which has come down to us and which can be of interest in our present study. The Novels, of which about one hundred and seventy are extant, were probably never collected officially; they are mainly in Greek; the greater number relate to public and ecclesiastical affairs, and some of them are as long as a modern act of parliament. The Digest is divided into fifty books, treating of subjects roughly in the order of the Code, and all divided into several titles, except books 30-32; the titles, supplied with rubrics, are subdivided into statements of law or excerpts from the jurisconsults adapted to changed times and conditions.

The Code is the most important part of the *Corpus* as a source relating to the Germans. It consists of twelve books divided into titles, each with a rubric. Under each title are grouped in chronological order the edicts or constitutions from Hadrian to the year 534, but with many sup-

[1] This second revised edition of the Code is the only one that has come down to us.

[2] The best edition is that published at Berlin, 3 vols. (1877-1899): vol. i contains the *Institutiones*, ed. by P. Krüger, and the *Digesta*, ed. by T. Mommsen; vol. ii consists of the *Codex*, ed. by P. Krüger; and vol. iii, the *Novellae*, ed. by R. Schoell and W. Kroll. There is a German translation of the entire *Corpus* by K. E. Otto, B. Schilling, and K. F. F. Sintenis, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1831-9); and an English translation of the *Digesta* by C. H. Monro (vol. i, Cambridge, 1904), and of the *Institutiones* by J. B. Moyle (Oxford, 1883).

pressions and amendments intended to bring them up to date. Most of the laws of the Theodosian Code were incorporated into the code of Justinian, and the sixteenth book of the former—on the Catholic church—became the first of the latter, so that Justinian's compilation opens most impressively with definitions of dogma and penalties for heresy. Of the whole mass of statutes in the Code, twenty-three are prior to Septimius Severus; nearly two hundred were issued by him and Caracalla jointly; two hundred and fifty by Caracalla alone; about four hundred and fifty by Alexander Severus; over two hundred and seventy by Gordian III; over twelve hundred by Diocletian and Maximian jointly; two hundred by Constantine; about the same number jointly by Valentinian II, Theodosius the Great and Arcadius; nearly one hundred and seventy by Valentinian II alone; about one hundred and eighty by Arcadius; about one hundred and ninety by Theodosius II; and nearly four hundred by Justinian himself.

These codes, whether the Theodosian or that of Justinian, may be viewed in two different ways as sources relating to the Germans. They may be considered either as an official kaleidoscopic picture of the shifting imperial fortunes incident to the immigration and invasions, or as a mine of specific facts about the Germans, their rights and duties and relations with other peoples. In spite of the high-sounding, pompous style and the difficulty of interpreting the laws, they often offer suggestions of an attitude toward the Germanic invasions which cannot be so well secured elsewhere. Thus a law of 409 reads:

> We have subjected to our empire the barbarian nation of the Scyri, now that the Huns with whom they were allied have been overwhelmed. Wherefore, we permit landed proprietors to take men of this nation in order to increase the number of

laborers on their estates, provided that such men shall not be denied any of the rights which pertain to *coloni*. It shall not be permitted to take anyone of them from the estate to which he shall have been attached or to entice such a one away, on pain of punishment; let every fugitive be pursued and returned to his master. They shall work, moreover, as freemen under order and to the profit of the proprietor, but it is not permitted to condemn them to slavery or sell them . . .[1]

Imperial laws afford us nearly all the clews we have to the condition of German soldiers in the imperial armies. They seem to distinguish two classes:[2] the *foederati*, a body of troops who served voluntarily or by contract, and the *dediticii* or *laeti*, who had been taken by force and were considered of inferior condition. The former usually received pay in money or in kind, while the latter received lands to cultivate and their military service was normally hereditary.[3]

The laws are particularly concerned with military affairs, and there are several defensive measures against warring barbarians.[4] In this connection may be mentioned one of the Novels of Valentinian III (440) which announces the departure of "Genseric's by no means small fleet from Carthage and its sudden coming and threatened plundering all along the shore," and states at the same time that "the army of our father, the unconquered Theodosius [II], is drawing nigh;" that "we believe the most excellent

[1] Theodosian Code, v, 6, 3. The victory over the Scyri is mentioned by Zosimus (iv, 34); and Sozomen, speaking of their fate, adds: "I have seen many of them in Bithynia, living scattered over estates and tilling the hills and dales" (ix, 5).

[2] Theodosian Code, vii, 13, 16.

[3] *Ibid.*, vii, 20, 12.

[4] *Ibid.*, vii, 1, 1; xii, 1, 177; xv, 1, 51; etc.

patrician Aetius to be near at hand with a large force;" and that "the most illustrious master of the soldiery, Sigisvuld, is active in arraying both *milites* and *foederati* for the defense of the cities and the coasts."

Among the laws are such widely different references to the barbarians as the fate of Stilicho;[1] the prohibition, under penalty of forfeiture and perpetual banishment, of the assumption of Gothic clothing within the city of Rome;[2] and marriage relations between Romans and Germans.[3] These are but few and paltry evidences of the possibilities of a special study of the great Roman codes.

The code of Justinian was never widely used in the western provinces of the empire. During the century which separated his work from that of Theodosius II, Germans had settled extensively, and in most cases permanently, in the west. The various tribes had brought with them from their old homes across the Rhine and the Danube their own customary law, and in their new homes they found in force the elaborate provisions of the Theodosian code.

[1] Theodosian Code, ix, 42, 21-22.

[2] *Ibid.*, xiv, 10, 1-4.

[3] A law of the year 370 (Theodosian Code, iii, 14, 1) forbade marriage between *provinciales* and *gentiles*. It used to be supposed that this law aimed to prevent the union of Romans and Germans, but Fustel de Coulanges has made some clever explanations to the contrary. After calling attention to a large number of marriages which did take place, according to the narrative sources, between Germans and Romans, he sums up his contention: "The law of 370 was only the application of the old principle which invalidated marriage between persons of different civil status; it had no bearing on racial differences. Now a German could become a Roman citizen; he could certainly, if he had served in the armies of Rome, obtain at the end of a certain time a kind of partial citizenship which would assure him the rights of *connubium* and also of *commercium* . . . " (*L'invasion germanique et la fin de l'empire*, pp. 399-400, note).

The unlettered sons of the northern forests must have been greatly impressed by the solemn majesty of Roman law, its codes and digests, its edicts and rescripts and titles and rubrics and opinions of Papinian, its order and pomposity. Perhaps they admired Roman law because it was too complicated for their comprehension and too elaborate for their operation. At any rate, the chieftains or clergy of several different tribes worked over the Theodosian Code very soon after their settlement, and simplified and adapted its provisions to the needs of their people.[1] And under the same influence, if not from the same motives, the barbarians gradually committed to writing their own customary law, in barbarous Latin, it is true, but they could hardly be expected to evolve expressions with grace and elegance. It is really impossible to estimate to what extent within a given "kingdom" the barbarian adaptations of Roman law were used, and to what extent the tribal law. It is probable from natural and obvious deductions, although hypothetical, that versions of Roman law survived for the old-time Roman citizens and their descendants while the barbarians themselves observed their customary law.

The earliest revision of Roman law with a view to changed conditions in the west, of which we know, is the *Edictum* of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. It was prepared, perhaps by Cassiodorus, about the year 500 and was based on previous codes and "novels" and on the writings of the jurists, especially the Sentences of Paul. It contained one hundred and fifty-four articles arranged at random and touching all branches of law, particularly criminal law and

[1] In addition to the adaptations of the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, and Burgundians, mentioned below, see the *Lex Romana Raetica Curiensis*, edited by K. Zeumer in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Leges*, vol. v (Hanover, 1889).

procedure. That it was intended for all of Theodoric's subjects, we gather from the epilogue:

These things, as far as our occupations would allow of our attending to them, or as they occurred at the moment to our mind, we have ordered for the common benefit of all, whether barbarians or Romans, and do desire that the devotion of all, whether barbarians or Romans, will keep them inviolate. Those cases which either the brevity of the *Edictum* or our public cares have not allowed us to comprehend in the foregoing, must be terminated when they arise, by the regular course of the laws. Nor let any person, of whatsoever dignity or wealth or power or military rank or honor he may be, think that he may in any manner infringe any one of these provisions, which we have collected chiefly out of the *Novellae* and the sanctions of the old law. And let all commissioners (*cognitores*) and all framers of decisions know that if in anything they shall violate these edicts, they will be deservedly struck with the penalty of proscription and banishment. But if perchance any influential personage or his procurator or agent or any farmer of the revenue, whether he be a barbarian or a Roman, shall in any manner of cause not allow these edicts to be observed, and if the judge who is trying the case shall not be able to hinder and block them, nor to vindicate the law as here laid down, if he has any care for his own safety let him lay aside every suggestion of timidity and at once bring before our notice a full report of the whole case. Only in this way will he himself be absolved from blame: inasmuch as the provisions made for the security of all the provincials ought to be carefully guarded by the zeal of the whole community.[1]

This is confirmed by a passage from the *Variae* of Cassiodorus:

By God's help, knowing that the Goths live side by side with

[1] From T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iii, p. 311.

the Italians, we have judged it necessary in order to avoid possible disorders among peoples who have mutual interests, to appoint as count for you this person whose good character is known to us and who, conformably to our edicts, is to decide every suit between two Goths. If any suit is brought between a Goth and a Roman, he will be joined by a Roman legal expert in order to decide the case justly. A dispute involving two Romans will be taken before the Roman judges whom we have appointed in the provinces.

Thus everyone will observe his own laws, and despite the diversity of judges, there will be the same justice for every one. Thus with God's assistance, both nations will enjoy the advantage of security. Know ye that we have an equal good will for all, and those will recommend themselves more particularly to our affection who are careful to observe the laws.

We hate all disorder; high crimes we deplore together with their authors. Our piety detests violence. It is not might but right which should decide disputes. Why use force when you have courts? We give salaries to judges and our treasury supports so many offices not in order to multiply suits which will engender hatred between our subjects, for, submitted to the same power, all must be united in affection. We appeal to both peoples whom we love equally. The Goths, whose property adjoins that of the Romans, should be united to them by good will; the Romans should have great love for the Goths, who, in time of peace, gain for their benefit a marked increase in population, and who, in time of war, protect the whole commonwealth. Let the Goths obey therefore the judge established by us; let them submit to his legal decisions. Our aim is to satisfy their interests and the interests of our empire.[1]

More ambitious and important than the *Edictum Theoderici* was the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*,[2] compiled by

[1] vii, 3.

[2] Edited by G. Haenel (Bonn, 1849). For an excellent rearrangement and German translation, see M. Conrat, *Breviarium Alaricianum*,

commissioners appointed by Alaric II, king of the Visigoths, with the approval of his bishops and nobles, and published in southern Gaul in the year 506. The compilation was designated in the sixteenth century the *breviarium Alarici,* or *Aniani* (from the secretary, Anianus, who certified the copies). Haenel has estimated that the compilers used for the *leges,* three hundred and ninety-eight edicts of the thirty-four hundred in the Theodosian Code, thirty-three of the hundred and forty post-Theodosian Novels, twenty-two of the Gregorian Code, and two of the Hermogenian; and for the *ius,* excerpts from the Institutes of Gaius and from the Sentences of Paul, and a single quotation from Papinian. The Roman law of the Visigoths exerted considerable influence in the west, even in the Salic law and in the capitularies of the Carolingians; and until the rise of the school at Bologna in the twelfth century, it was used in western Europe more than Justinian's code.

Another abridgment of Roman law was promulgated by Gundobad, king of the Burgundians, about the year 516 for his Roman subjects.[1] It is divided into forty-seven titles, deals with private and criminal law and with judicial procedure, and is based on the same sources as the Breviary of Alaric. It is half code and half text-book, extremely simple in outline and scope, with only occasional quotation of authorities, such as *secundum legum novellam,* or *secundum Gaium.*

The customary or "Germanic" laws of the invaders were gradually committed to writing in different places

römisches Recht im fränkischen Reich, in systematischer Darstellung (Leipzig, 1903). *Cf.* also C. Lécrivain, "Remarques sur l'interpretation de la Lex Romana Visigothorum" in *Annales du Midi,* vol. i, pp. 145-182 (1891).

[1] Edited by L. R. De Salis in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Legum sectio I,* vol. ii (Hanover, 1893).

between the middle of the fifth and the middle of the ninth centuries.[1] Burgundians,[2] Visigoths,[3] and Lombards possessed written tribal laws probably fifty to a hundred years after their settlement on Roman territory. Compilations were made by Salian and Ripuarian Franks, Alamanni,[4] and Swabians during the Merovingian period; by Bavarians near the close of that period; and in Carolingian times, codes were drawn up by peoples who had been in slight contact with Rome,—Frisians, Saxons, Angles, and Thuringians.

All these German codes are written in Latin, except the Anglo-Saxon laws, which belong to a period posterior to our present review. It is extremely doubtful whether they are even Latin translations of German texts. On this point, especially with regard to the Salic law, many battles have been fought and many lances have been broken. The

[1] See H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1887-1892); J. F. Schulte, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte*, 6th ed. (Stuttgart, 1892); and R. Schröder, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1898).

[2] The Burgundian compilation bears the name of Gundobad, who likewise directed the above-noted adaptation of Roman law. The *Lex Gundobada* is edited by L. R. De Salis in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Leges*, vol. ii (Hanover, 1893). There is a French translation by J. F. A. Peyré (Lyons, 1855). See K. Binding, *Das burgundisch-romanische Königreich* (Leipzig, 1868).

[3] The Visigothic code, which was issued probably in the second half of the sixth century by King Reccessvindus, is edited by K. Zeumer in *Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum* (Hanover, 1894). There is a French translation by L. Beauchet (Paris, 1889). See F. Dahn, *Westgothische Studien* (Würzburg, 1874).

[4] The laws of the Alamanni were gradually brought together; perhaps the first codification was made under Clotaire II (613-628). They are edited by C. Lehmann in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Leges*, vol. v (Hanover, 1888).

net result seems to be a general confession of ignorance as to whether there was an original Frankish law-book or not, and if there was, it is not known when or where a Latin translation was prepared. We can only say that the Latin version, as we have it, was not made before Clovis had extended his power to the Loire.[1]

The Salic law[2] has a prologue of much later date than the *Lex* itself, which places its composition at a time when the Franks were governed by *proceres;* but from the fact that the law bears no trace either of paganism or of Christianity, it is reasoned that it must have been drawn up while the people were still divided over religion, that is, toward the close of the reign of Clovis. It is contended, however, that our redaction is subsequent to the year 657.[3] The older manuscripts, moreover, contain the so-called "Malberg Gloss," interpolated Frankish words and phrases, which serve in some cases to explain the Latin words and in any case to complicate further the questions involved in the origin and dates of the Salic compilation. This and much new material, inserted by private copyists, render the reconstruction of the original text more or less problematical.

The Salic law is very homely. In scope and arrangement it is not to be compared with the great imperial codes of Theodosius and Justinian, or even with the adapted codes of Theodoric and Alaric. It consists largely of stated fines or "compositions" to be paid for various commonplace injuries, such as assault or pig-stealing, and it

[1] See *Lex Salica,* tit. 47.

[2] Edited by J. H. Hessels with very valuable notes by H. Kern (London, 1880). There is a French translation in I. Favé, *L'empire des Francs* (Paris, 1888). See M. Krammer, "Kritische Untersuchungen zur Lex Salica" in *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichte* (1905).

[3] See H. Brunner, *op. cit.*

deals almost entirely with what we should call the law of torts and crimes and the law of procedure. Of its original sixty-five titles, only six or seven are devoted to the law of family, property and inheritance. In spite of the uncertainty surrounding its origin, the Salic law is a very vital source of information about the Germans. It reflects the every-day life of the Franks of the Merovingian days in a singularly naive fashion, and suggests the hypothesis that some of its features which are not found in Roman law, such as the exclusion of daughters from inheritance, the "composition" for crime, and the usage of holding a whole family responsible for the misdeeds of one of its members, had had an historical evolution in Germany before the barbarians came into contact with the empire.

More detailed than the Salic law, and consequently especially useful for a study of Germanic law, is the Lombard code,[1] which consists of the *Edictum* of Rothari, published in 643, and of additions made by succeeding kings. The *Edictum* itself contains three hundred and seventy-eight titles, relating to a great variety of subjects but chiefly to crimes and judicial procedure. The epilogue to the edict is interesting:

We now confirm this edict, which by God's grace we have composed after earnest study and long vigils. By the Divine favor we have persevered in our task, inquiring into and calling to remembrance the ancient laws of our fathers. Those which were not written we have nevertheless learned; and we have added to them those things which seemed to be expedient for

[1] Edited by F. Bluhme in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Leges,* vol. iv (Hanover, 1868). It is also in *Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum* (Hanover, 1869). There is a helpful summary of the Lombard laws, from which most of the following quotations are taken, in T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders,* vol. vi, pp. 174-238.

the common welfare of all, and of our own race; acting herein with the advice and by the consent of the nobles, the judges, and all our most successful army; and we now order them to be written down on this parchment, with this one reservation, that all things which by the Divine clemency have been ascertained by our own accurate inquiry, or which old men have been able to remember concerning the ancient laws of the Lombards, are to be subjoined to this edict. We add, moreover, hereto our confirmation by *gairethinx*, that this law may be firm and enduring, and that both in our own most prosperous times and in all time to come it may be kept inviolably by all our successors.

Some idea of the peculiarities of Lombard law may be obtained from the following partial list of "compositions," or fines for damages:

FOR BODILY INJURIES TO A FREE PERSON.[1]

Blows struck in sudden quarrel causing a wound or bruise 3 solidi apiece up to 12 solidi [2]

(If more blows are inflicted they are not to be counted, but let the wounded man rest content with himself.)

Blow with the fist..... 3 solidi
" " " palm of the hand..... 6 "
Blows on the head, only breaking the skin....6 solidi up to 18 "
" " " " breaking bones .....(per bone) 12 "

(No count to be taken above 36 solidi; and the broken bones are to be counted on this principle that one bone shall be found large enough to make an audible sound when thrown against a shield at twelve feet distance on the road, the said feet to be measured from the foot of a man of moderate stature, not the hand.)

The deprivation of an eye is to be atoned for by the payment of half the fine due for actual homicide, according to the quality of the person injured.

[1] Tit. 43-75.

[2] A *solidus* may be taken as equivalent to twelve shillings or three dollars.

Cutting off the nose.....half the fine for homicide
Cutting a lip ..... 13 solidi
If so cut that 1, 2, or 3 teeth appear..... 20 "
Knocking out the front teeth .....(per tooth) 16 "
" " " grinders .....(per tooth) 8 "
Cutting off an ear.....quarter the fine for homicide
Wound on the face ..... 16 solidi
" " " nose, causing a scar..... 16 "
" " " ear, " " " ..... 16 "
" " " arm, without a fracture..... 8 "
Blow on the chest ..... 20 "
Piercing a rib ..... 8 "
Cutting off a hand ..... half the fine for homicide
If so stricken as to cause paralysis, but not cut off....quarter the fine for homicide
Cutting off a thumb ..... a sixth of the fine for homicide
" " " second finger ..... 17 solidi
" " " third " ..... 6 "
" " " fourth " ..... 8 "
" " " fifth " ..... 16 "
" " " great toe ..... 6 "
" " " second " ..... 6 "
" " " third " ..... 3 "
" " " fourth " ..... 3 "
" " " fifth " ..... 2 "
" " " foot ..... half the fine for homicide

For all the wounds and blows above mentioned, which may pass between free men, we have purposely ordained a larger composition than was in use among our ancestors, in order that the *faida* (feud), which is enmity, may be postponed after the receipt of the above-mentioned composition, and that more may not be required, nor any thought of guile be harbored in the heart; but let the case be heard between the parties, and friendship remain. And should it happen that within the space of a year he who was wounded dies of the wounds themselves, then let the striker pay in *angargathungi,* that is the fine for homicide, according to the quality of the person injured, what he was worth.

The position of women among the Lombards does not appear to have been very high:

It shall not be lawful for any free woman living according to the laws of the Lombards under our sway, to live under the power of her own free will, or as it is called to be *selpmundia*, but she must always remain under the power of men, if not a husband or relative, under that of the king's court, nor shall she have the power of giving or alienating any property, movable or immovable, without the consent of him in whose *mundium* she is living.[1]

From the later supplements of king Liutprand we hear a good deal about the divine right of kings. The prologue states:

He [Liutprand] has conceived the idea of framing these laws, not by his own foresight, but by the will and inspiration of God; because the king's heart is in the hands of God, as is witnessed by the wisdom of Solomon, who said, "As the rush of water, so is the heart of the king in God's hand,—if He shall keep it back, everything will be dried up, but if He in His mercy gives it free course, everything is watered and filled with healthfulness." So too the apostle James in his epistle says, "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above and cometh down from the Father of lights." . . .

Liutprand's laws show noteworthy traces of Roman and Christian influence. One, with reference to the restriction of wager of battle, is illustrative:[2]

We have now ordained that the punishment for the murder of a free man shall be the loss of the whole of the murderer's property: but certain men, perhaps through hardness of heart, have accused the relations of a man who has died in his bed of having poisoned him, and have therefore, according to the old

[1] Tit. 204.

[2] Laws of Liutprand, cxviii.

custom, challenged them to single combat. It seems to us a serious matter that the loss of a man's whole property should be caused by the weakness of a single shield; and we therefore ordain that in case any accusation of this kind should be brought in future, the accuser shall swear on the gospels that he does not bring it in malice, but has good grounds for his suspicion. Then he may proceed to battle according to the old custom, but if the accused person or his hired champion is defeated, let him pay, not his whole fortune, but a composition, as under the whole law, according to the rank of the murdered man.—For we are uncertain about the judgment of God, and we have heard of many persons unjustly losing their cause by wager of battle. But on account of the custom of our nation of the Lombards we cannot change the law itself.

The canon, or ecclesiastical, law constitutes the second great group of documentary sources which should be of use in studying the Germanic invasions.[1]

The Catholic Church increased greatly in importance as a political institution during the period of the most extensive barbarian settlements in the west, and its laws not only present a picture of general conditions but also in many instances refer directly to the newcomers. The extant laws are mainly the acts of general and local meetings of the clergy, for few of the early papal rescripts and letters have survived. That archives were kept at Rome comparatively early, we gather from a statement in the acts of a council held under pope Damasus *cca.* 370; and the lost register of Gregory the Great has been an object of painstaking study and fanciful reconstruction.[2] Not until we reach the time

[1] For guides to the study of canon law, see J. B. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg-i-B., 1900-1904); and A. Tardif, *Histoire des sources du droit canonique* (Paris, 1887).

[2] See P. Ewald, "Studien zur Ausgabe des Register Gregors I," in *Neues Archiv für ä. deutsch. Geschichte* (1878), pp. 433-625.

of John VIII (d. 882), do we have an extensive fragment of a papal register.[1]

Our chief concern, then, is with the canons and decrees of church councils. It was only in the fourth century, when peace was assured to the Christians, that their bishops and doctors could publicly meet together and promulgate laws. These meetings were at first called *synodes*, and later *concilia*, a term now prevailing in the canon law of the west, the word *synod* being usually reserved to designate an assembly of clergy of a single diocese assembled under the presidency of their bishop. The so-called general or ecumenical councils — Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), Second of Constantinople (553), Third of Constantinople (680), Second of Nicaea (787), and Fourth of Constantinople (869)—were concerned almost entirely with definitions of faith and regulation of ecclesiastical discipline, and their canons are not very helpful for our purposes. It is the special local councils after the great general council of Nicaea, whose canons should be investigated.

In Spain, councils were held at Saragossa, Seville and Barcelona in the fourth century, and the acts of seventeen councils convened at Toledo between the years 400 and 694 are an excellent source of information about the religious, political and social conditions in the peninsula, about

[1] A collection of papal letters for the years 461-523 was published by A. Thiel (Braunsburg, 1868). S. Loewenfeld published a collection of over four hundred, extending from Gelasius I to Celestine III (Leipzig, 1885); and others are in the collection of J. v. Pflugk-Hartung, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1880-6). The Turin collection of papal bulls, ed. A. Tomasetti, is faulty and incomplete. *Cf.* also P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad an. post Christum nat. 1198*, second ed. revised by G. Wattenbach, S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885-8).

the Visigothic kingdom, and the relations between the Arian king and his Catholic subjects. Particularly important was the council of Toledo of 587, the year in which king Reccared was converted to Catholicism.[1]

The seven councils of Carthage, which were held between the years 348 and 424, are similarly useful for the history of the African provinces and for the rise of the Vandal power.

In Italy, the first canon source is a decretal of pope Siricius (384-398). Then there are the records of papal councils in 465 and in 499, and increasingly important ones under Symmachus, Gregory the Great (in 595 and in 601), Boniface III (in 606), Martin I (in 649), and Agatho (in 680).

Councils were held in Gaul as early as the year 314 (first of Arles), and thenceforth their canons run parallel as sources for the time with the narratives of Gregory of Tours, Fortunatus, the pseudo-Fredegarius, the *Gesta regum Francorum*, and the multitude of saints' lives. Every episcopal city of Gaul had its councils, meeting with greater or less regularity, — Arles, Tours, Orleans, Paris, Lyons, Vienne, Auxerre, Mâcon, and others.[2]

Christianity had early been spread in Britain, appearing in Ireland and Scotland about the middle of the fifth cen-

[1] The acts of the Spanish councils are in the collection of Cardinal J. Saenz de Aguirre, 6 vols. (Rome, 1753-5). See P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens* (Regensburg, 1874).

[2] The acts of the Gallic councils were collected and edited by P. Sirmond, 3 vols. (Paris, 1629), and two supplementary volumes were issued respectively by P. de la Lande and L. Odespun. A new edition is now being brought out in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Concilia:* vol. i is edited by F. Maassen (Hanover, 1893), and contains acts of councils from 511 to 695; vol. ii is edited by A. Werminghoff (Hanover and Leipzig, 1906), and contains acts of Gallic councils from 742 to 817.

tury, but no collection of canon law is known for that early period. Under the Anglo-Saxon rulers, the discipline of the English church was regulated by the provincial councils,[1] of which the one at Hertford in 673, presided over by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, was especially important. A collection of canon law in dialogue form was prepared by Egbert of York (d. 767). A large and valuable collection in sixty-four or sixty-nine books was made in Ireland at the beginning of the eighth century, styled the *Synodus Patritii* or *Hibernensis*.[2]

The councils held by Saint Boniface in Germany in the eighth century are almost too late for our review, but their proceedings are certainly suggestive.

The Catholic Church has never issued an official code of canon law, but has left that work to private initiative. Several such compilations were made comparatively early, but they were replaced, at least in the west, by the celebrated collection of Denis the Less[3] (*fl.* 525). Denis was "a Scythian by race but otherwise quite a Roman," according to Cassiodorus, his friend and associate.[4] He was a monk and spent most of his life at Rome. Versed in Greek and in the study of chronology, he introduced the usage of counting years from the birth of Christ. His collection of canon law was made, probably under pope Symmachus

[1] The acts of the British councils are best edited by A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1869).

[2] Edited by F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung* (Giessen, 1874). See P. Fournier, "De l'influence de la collection irlandaise sur la formation des collections canoniques" in *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger* (1899).

[3] The title *Exiguus*, which Denis gave himself, was only a term of humility.

[4] *De institutione divinarum litterarum*, ch. 23, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, vol. lxx, col. 1137.

(498-514), at the request of a certain Stephen, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, and embraced the fifty "Apostolic Constitutions," and one hundred and ninety-two canons of Greek councils, translated into Latin, together with twenty-one canons of the council of Sardica, one hundred and thirty-eight of the council of Carthage of 419, and thirty-eight papal decretals from Siricius to Anastasius II (384-498).[1]

Before bringing to a close these suggestions of possible documentary sources relating to the Germanic invasions, attention should be called to the penitentials, which have been the subject of considerable study in the last fifty years.[2] The penitentials are collections of rules prescribing penances for sins. Sometimes they contain the canons of the councils which enacted the penalties, but more often they simply enumerate the offenses and the penances analogous to the fines in the German laws. The oldest extant penitentials are probably of the sixth century. They afford glimpses of the social life of the times and acquaint us with what was deemed moral and what was deemed immoral. Perhaps the indications in the penitentials that the barbarians had vices as well as virtues might be helpful to anyone who is bent on forming an opinion concerning Germanic contributions to civilization and culture.

A complete history of the relations between Romans and

[1] The classical editions of these general councils and of many of the local synods by Labbe, Baluze, and Hardouin are incorporated in the standard edition of Coleti and Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence and Venice, 1759-1798).

[2] See especially two books by H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche* (Mainz, 1883), and *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren* (Düsseldorf, 1898); E. Göller, *Die päpstliche Pönitentiare von ihrem Ursprung bis zu ihrer Umgestaltung unter Pius V* (Rome, 1907); F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche* (Halle, 1851).

Germans would cover a period of seven or eight centuries. It would begin with the northern expansion of the Roman state, and would thenceforth parallel the growth and development of the commonwealth as well as its decline and disruption. It may seem as if our rapid survey of the principal narrative and documentary sources from Plutarch's "Life of Marius" and Caesar's "Commentaries" to Paul the Deacon's "History of the Lombards" and Liutprand's laws has indicated the existence of full and adequate material for such a history. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the whole range of extant sources which we have been reviewing,—biographies of famous generals, emperors, martyrs, and saints; occasional vague geographical notices; encomiums upon rulers; religious treatises and tracts; three or four military histories; scant and tiresome chronicles; poems, orations and rhetorical letters; and a few laws of state and church,—it will be remembered that not a single one was written purposely to acquaint posterity with the nature or method of the fusing of barbarians and imperial subjects or with the process of the dissolution of the western provinces of the Roman empire. Nor has it been possible, moreover, to convey an accurate notion of the fragmentary character, the irrelevancy, the lack of critical insight, the hopeless inadequacy, which distinguish almost all the existing material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In addition to the writings mentioned in the text or foot-notes, the following general guides and secondary works have been found most helpful.

GUIDES TO THE SOURCES.

Dahlmann—Waitz. *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*, 7th ed. by E. Brandenburg (Leipzig, 1906).

Ebert, A. *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, vols. i, ii (Leipzig, 1880); trans. into French by J. Aymeric and J. Condamin (Paris, 1884).

Gross, C. *Sources and Literature of English History from the earliest times to about 1485* (New York, 1900).

Hardy, T. D. *Descriptive Catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland to the end of the reign of Henry VII*, in "Rolls Series," vol. xxvi, part 1 (London, 1862).

Krumbacher, K. *Die Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1891).

Molinier, A. *Les sources de l'histoire de France; vol. i, Époque primitive, mérovingiens et carolingiens* (Paris, 1901).

Monod, G. *Études critiques sur les sources de l'histoire mérovingienne* (Paris, 1872).

Peter, H. *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1897).

Potthast, A. *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi,—Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Berlin, 1896).

Schäfer, A. *Quellenkunde der griechischen und römischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1885).

Teuffel, W. S., and Schwabe, L. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, trans. into English by G. C. W. Warr, 2 vols. (London, 1891-2).

Wattenbach, W. *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1893-4).

GENERAL SECONDARY WORKS.

Bury, J. B. *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene,* 2 vols. (London, 1889-92).

Chadwick, H. M. *The Origin of the English Nation* (Cambridge, 1907).

Cramer, J. *Die Verfassungsgeschichte der Germanen und Kelten* (Berlin, 1906).

Dahn, F. *Die Könige der Germanen,* 11 vols. (Leipzig, 1897-1908).

Dahn, F. *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker,* 4 vols. (Berlin, 1881-9).

Diehl, M. C. *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1901).

Dill, S. *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire* (London, 1898).

Elton, C. I. *Origins of English History,* 2nd ed. (London, 1890).

Freeman, E. A. *Western Europe in the Fifth Century* (London, 1904).

Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France,* 6 vols., completed by C. Jullian (Paris, 1875-1892); especially La Gaule romaine, L'invasion germanique et la fin de l'empire, and La monarchie franque.

Gams, P. B. *Die Kirchengeschichte Spaniens,* 3 vols. (Regensburg, 1862-74).

Gebhardt, B. *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* 2nd ed., vol. i (Stuttgart, 1901).

Gibbon, E. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* ed. by J. B. Bury, 7 vols. (London, 1900-1902).

Glover, T. R. *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1901).

Güldenpenning, A. *Geschichte des oströmischen Reiches unter den Kaisern Arcadius und Theodosius II* (Halle, 1885).

Hartmann, L. M. *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1898-1903).

Hodgkin, T. *Italy and her Invaders,* 8 vols. (London, 1880-1900): vol. i, The Visigothic Invasion; ii, The Hunnish and Vandal Invasions; iii, The Ostrogothic Invasion; iv, The Imperial Restoration; v, The Lombard Invasion; vi, The Lombard Kingdom; vii, The Frankish Invasion; viii, The Frankish Empire.

Kaufmann, G. *Deutsche Geschichte bis auf Karl den Grossen* (Leipzig, 1880).

Kurth, G. *Clovis,* 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Paris, 1901).

Lavisse, E. Ed. *Histoire de France* (Paris, 1900 *et seq.*): vol. i, Les origines, La Gaule indépendante et La Gaule romaine, by G. Bloch;

ii, Le Christianisme, les barbares, mérovingiens et carolingiens, by C. Bayet, C. Pfister and A. Kleinclausz.

Martroye, F. *Genséric, la conquête vandale en Afrique et la destruction de l'empire d'occident* (Paris, 1907).

Martroye, F. *L'occident à l'époque byzantine, Goths et Vandales* (Paris, 1903).

Mommsen, T. *History of Rome*, and *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, trans. into English by W. P. Dickson, 5 vols. (New York, 1903-5).

Müllenhoff, K. *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, revised by M. Roediger and others, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1883-1900).

Schiller, H. *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 2 vols. (Gotha, 1883-7).

Schmidt, L. *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgange der Völkerwanderung* (Berlin, 1904).

Seeck, O. *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1895-1901).

Villari, P. *Le invasioni barbariche in Italia* (Milan, 1901), trans. into English by L. Villari, 2 vols. (New York, 1902).

Viollet, P. *Droit public, histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1890-1903).

Waitz, G. *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, 3rd ed., 5 vols. (Berlin, 1880).

Wietersheim, K. A. W. E. von. *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, ed. by F. Dahn, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1880-1).

Zippel, G. *Deutsche Völkerbewegungen in der Römerzeit* (Königsberg, 1895).

INDEX OF SOURCES

Ablavius, 98, 159.
Aelius Junius Cordus, 59 note.
Aelius Lampridius. *See* Augustan Histories.
Aelius Spartianus. *See* Augustan Histories.
Agathias, 70 note, 169 note.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 54, 60 *sqq.*, 74 *sqq.*
Ammonius, 94 note.
Annales, 145 *sqq.*
Anonymus Cuspiniani, 148 *sq.*, 152.
Anonymus Valesianus, 149, 153, 164 note, 168.
Apollinaris Sidonius. *See* Sidonius Apollinaris.
Appian, 21 note, 39, 40.
Asinius Quadratus, 70 note.
Athenaeus, 21 note.
Aufidius Bassus, 36.
Augustan Histories, 54 *sqq.*
Augustine, 88, 104 *sqq.*
Aurelius Victor, 54, 59.
Ausonius, 138.

Barbarian Codes, 52, 211 *sqq.*
Bede, 192, 196.
Braulio of Saragossa, 191.
Breviarium Alarici. See Lex Romana Visigothorum.

Caesar, 30 *sqq.*, 52 *sq.*
Candidus, 99.
Canon Law, 218 *sqq.*
Cassiodorus, 119, 149, 152 *sqq.*, 168, 208 *sqq.*
Cassius Dio. *See* Dio Cassius.
Catulus, 20.
Chronica Italica, 150 *sq.*
Chronicles, 145 *sq.*
Cicero, 24, 31, 142.
Claudian, 138 *sq.*
Code, Gregorian, 200.
Code, Hermogenian, 201.
Code of Justinian, 203 *sqq.*
Code, Theodosian, 114 note, 202 *sqq.*
Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, 98 *sq.*
Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi, 150, 154.
Corippus, 143.
Corpus iuris civilis. See Code of Justinian.
Count Marcellinus. *See* Marcellinus *Comes.*

Denis *Exiguus*, 221 *sq.*
Dexippus, 68 note, 89.
Dio Cassius, 54 *sqq.*, 159.
Diodorus of Sicily, 24.

Edictum Theoderici, 208 *sqq.*
Ennodius, 128, 156 note.
Epiphanius, 119.
Eratosthenes, 18 note.
Eucherius, 127 note.
Eugenius of Toledo, 191.
Eugippius, 128 *sqq.*
Eumenius, 134 *sq.*
Eunapius of Sardis, 69 note, 89, 99.
Eusebius of Caesarea, 106, 118 *sq.*, 146 *sq.*

Eutropius, 54, 59, 75, 196.
Excerpta de legationibus, 98 *sqq.*

Fasti, 145 *sqq.*
Flavius Felix, 143.
Flavius Vopiscus. *See* Augustan Histories.
Florentinus, 143.
Florus, 39, 160 note.
Fortunatus, 189 *sq.*
Fredegarius Scholasticus. *See pseudo*-Fredegarius.
Fulgentius, 143 *sq.*

Gainea, 94 note.
Gennadius, 192.
Georgius Syncellus. *See* Syncellus.
Gesta regum Francorum, 194 *sq.*
Gildas, 181.
Gregory of Tours, 98, 184 *sqq.*
Gregory the Great, 182 *sqq.*

Herodian, 54, 56.
Hippolytus, 193.
Horace, 48 note.

Idatius, 193.
Ildefonsus of Toledo, 192.
Isidore of Seville, 150, 191 *sq.*

Jerome, 106, 116, 121 *sqq.*, 147, 192 note, 193.
Jordanes, 98, 155, 157 *sqq.*
Josephus, 25.
Julian of Toledo, 191.
Julius Capitolinus. *See* Augustan Histories.
Justin, 21 note, 106.
Justinian, 203 *sqq.*

Lactantius, 107 note.
Lex Gundobada, 212.
Lex Romana Burgundionum, 211.
Lex Romana Raetica Curiensis, 208 note.
Lex Romana Visigothorum, 201, 210 *sq.*
Libanius, 137.
Liber pontificalis, 182 note.
Liutprand. *See* Lombard Laws.
Livy, 21, 36, 40.
Lombard Laws, 182, 214 *sqq.*
Luxorius, 143.

Malchus, 99, 102 *sq.*
Marcellinus. *See* Ammianus Marcellinus.
Marcellinus *Comes*, 148, 152.
Marcus Maximus, 191.
Marius Aventicensis, 150, 154, 194.
Marius Maximus, 57.
Menander, 169 note.

Namatianus. *See* Rutilius Namatianus.
Notitia Dignitatum, 85 note.
Novellae, 203 *sq.*

Olympiodorus, 89, 99.
Origo Langobardorum, 182 note, 196.
Orosius, 86 note, 88, 96 note, 106 *sqq.*, 159, 162.
Ovid, 41 note, 145 note.

Panegyrici, 134 *sqq.*
Paschale Campanum, 149, 153.
Paterculus. *See* Velleius.
Paulinus of Nola, 127 note.
Paulinus of Pella, 141 note.
Paul the Deacon, 150, 182, 184, 195 *sqq.*
Pelagius II, 182 *sq.*
Penitentials, 222.
Peutinger, Table of, 45.
Photius, 89, 98 *sq.*
Pliny, Elder, 17, 36, 41, 44.
Pliny, Younger, 36 note, 46 *sq.*
Plutarch, 19 *sqq.*
Pompeius Trogus. *See* Trogus Pompeius.
Pomponius Mela, 41, 44.

Posidonius, 21.
Priscus, 99 *sqq.*, 159.
Procopius, 88, 155, 168 *sqq.*
Prosper of Aquitaine, 147.
Prosper Tiro, 148.
Prudentius, 138.
Pseudo-Fredegarius, 192 *sqq.*
Ptolemy, 45, 159.
Pytheas, 16 *sqq.*

Quintilian, 36.

Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, 98.
Roman Law, 199 *sqq.*
Rothari. *See* Lombard Laws.
Rufinus, 119.
Rutilius Namatianus, 139 *sq.*

Salic Law, 212 *sqq.*
Sallust, 20.
Salvian, 88, 124 *sqq.*
Secundus, 184, 196.
Seneca *Rhetor*, 36 note.
Sextus Julius Africanus, 106, 146.
Sidonius Apollinaris, 140 *sqq.*
Sisebutus, 191.
Socrates, 119.
Sozomen, 119.
Stephanus of Byzantium, 17.
Strabo, 17, 21 note, 41 *sqq.*, 52.
Suetonius, 39 *sq.*, 46, 57, 60.
Suidas, 99 note.
Sulla, 20.
Sulpicius Alexander, 98.
Sulpicius Severus, 120, 128 note.
Symmachus, 137, 159.
Syncellus, 70 note.
Synesius, 140.

Table of Peutinger. *See* Peutinger, Table of.
Tacitus, 35, 39, 46 *sqq.*, 60, 159.
Themistius, 135 *sqq.*
Theodoret, 119.
Theodosian Code. *See* Code, Theodosian.
Trebellius Pollio. *See* Augustan Histories.
Trogus Pompeius, 21 note, 159.

Ulfilas, 86 note.

Valesian Fragment. *See Anonymus Valesianus.*
Velleius Paterculus, 27 note, 37 *sqq.*
Venantius Fortunatus. *See* Fortunatus.
Venerable Bede. *See* Bede.
Victor of Aquitaine, 149.
Victor Aurelius. *See* Aurelius Victor.
Victor Tonnennensis, 149 *sq.*, 153 *sq.*
Victor Vitensis, 127, 143.
Vincent of Lerins, 127 note.
Vopiscus. *See* Augustan Histories.
Vulcacius Gallicanus. *See* Augustan Histories.

Xiphilinus, 55.

Zonaras, 55, 70 note.
Zosimus, 88 *sqq.*, 104, 161 *sq.*

VITA

THE author of the foregoing pages was born at Afton, New York, May 16, 1882. He prepared for college at Afton High School and graduated from Columbia College in 1904, with highest general honors. The following year he was President's University Scholar in European History at Columbia and received the degree of Master of Arts. In 1905-1906 he was Fellow in European History in Columbia University. He attended courses under Professors Robinson, Sloane, Osgood, Dunning, Shepherd, Botsford, Burgess, and J. B. Moore, and was a member of Professor Robinson's seminar. He is a member of the American Historical Association and of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. Since February 1907 he has been Lecturer in History in Columbia University.